



**University of
Zurich**^{UZH}

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
University Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 1981

The Tiqqune Sopherim and Other Theological Corrections in the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament

McCarthy, Carmel

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-157914>

Monograph

Published Version

Originally published at:

McCarthy, Carmel (1981). The Tiqqune Sopherim and Other Theological Corrections in the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament. Freiburg, Switzerland / Göttingen, Germany: Universitätsverlag / Vandenhoeck Ruprecht.

McCARTHY · TIQQUNE SOPHERIM

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS

Published by the Biblical Institute of the University
of Fribourg Switzerland
and the Seminar für Biblische Zeitgeschichte
of the University of Münster i. W. Federal Republic of Germany
Editor: Othmar Keel
Coeditors: Bernard Trémel and Erich Zenger

The Author:

Carmel McCarthy, R.S.M., graduated in Semitic Languages from University College Dublin in 1966. For the following two years she did post-graduate studies and tutorial work in Semitic Languages at this same University, and was awarded the degree of Master of Arts in 1968. From 1968 to 1972 she studied theology at the University of Fribourg, Switzerland, and was awarded the Licentiate in Sacred Theology by this same University in 1972. In 1979-80 she did course work and further research for a doctorate in the University of Fribourg. She was awarded a Doctorate in Divinity (S.T.D.) by this University in 1980. Since 1972 she has been a Lecturer in Religious Studies at Our Lady of Mercy College of Education, Blackrock, Co. Dublin, and part-time Lecturer in Semitic Languages at University College Dublin.

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS 36

CARMEL McCARTHY

THE TIQQUNE SOPHERIM

and
Other Theological Corrections
in the
Masoretic Text of the Old Testament

UNIVERSITÄTSVERLAG FREIBURG SCHWEIZ
VANDENHOECK & RUPRECHT GÖTTINGEN
1981

CIP-Kurztitelaufnahme der Deutschen Bibliothek

McCarthy, Carmel:

The Tiqqune Sopherim and Other Theological Corrections
in the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament / Carmel
McCarthy.

Freiburg (Schweiz): Universitätsverlag;
Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1981.

(Orbis biblicus et orientalis; 36)

ISBN 3-7278-0242-1 (Universitätsverlag)

ISBN 3-525-53344-6 (Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht)

Publication subsidized by the Fribourg University Council,
Fribourg Switzerland

© 1981 by Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz
Paulusdruckerei Freiburg Schweiz

Digitalisat erstellt durch Florian Lippke, Departement
für Biblische Studien, Universität Freiburg Schweiz

For my Father and in
memory of my Mother

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

Table of Contents	7
Foreword	11
Abbreviations	12
Introduction	15
CHAPTER 1 THE PROBLEM STATED - SOME MODERN AND CONTEMPORARY OPINIONS	17
CHAPTER 2 ANALYSIS OF THE MAIN SOURCES ATTESTING THE TRADITION OF SCRIBAL EMENDATIONS	25
(a) The Earliest Lists and their Contexts; the Siphre on Numbers and the Mekhilta of R. Ishmael	25
(b) Citations of these Early Lists in the Yalqut Shime'oni	30
(c) The Lists in the Siphre Zutṭa and Midrash Haggadol	31
(d) The Tanḥuma Tradition	33
(e) Other Explicit References to the Term <u>Tiqqune Sopherim</u> in Passages which do not Contain Lists	37
(f) The <u>Tiqqune Sopherim</u> Tradition in the "Book of Lights and Watchtowers" of Ya'qub al-Qirqisani	39
(g) The Masoretic Lists	42
(h) The <u>Tiqqune Sopherim</u> Traditions in Pugio Fidei of Raymund Martin	52
(i) Charts Illustrating the Development and Relationships of the Various Lists and Traditions	54
(j) Some Observations and Tentative Conclusions	58
CHAPTER 3 AN EXAMINATION OF THE TIQQUNE SOPHERIM WITH A VIEW TO ESTABLISHING THE AUTHENTICITY OF EACH SO-CALLED EMENDATION	61
(a) Zechariah 2:12	61
(b) Genesis 18:22	70
(c) 1 Samuel 3:13 and Job 7:20	76
(d) 2 Samuel 16:12	81
(e) 2 Samuel 20:1; 1 Kings 12:16 and 2 Chronicles 10:16	85
(f) Ezekiel 8:17	91
(g) Hosea 4:7; Jeremiah 2:11 and Psalm 106:20	97
(h) Habakkuk 1:12	105
(i) Malachi 1:12 and 1:13	111

(j)	Job 32:3	115
(k)	Lamentations 3:20	120
(l)	Numbers 11:15 and 12:12	123
(m)	Brief Summary of the Results of this Examination	129

EXCURSUS:	The Passages in the Septuagint which the Sages Changed for King Ptolemy	131
-----------	--	-----

CHAPTER 4	A STUDY OF THE USE OF THE AL-TIQRE EXEGETICAL DEVICE WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE EARLY MIDRASHIM AND THE BABYLONIAN TALMUD	139
1.	Introductory Remarks	139
2.	Types of Changes Associated with this Formula	140
	(a) Change in Vocalisation	141
	(b) Metathesis of Two Consonants in a Word	141
	(c) Substitution of One Consonant for Another	142
	(d) Metathesis in the Structure of a Phrase	143
	(e) Omission of a Consonant	144
	(f) Addition of an Extra Word	144
	(g) Addition of One or More Consonants	145
	(h) Subdivision of a Word into Two	145
	(i) Reading Two Words as One	146
	(j) Change of a Personal Suffix or Pronoun	146
3.	Types of Meaning or Exegesis Resulting from the Use of this Formula	147
	(a) Having to Do with God	147
	(b) Man in his Relationship with God	148
	(c) Clarification or Illustration of Prescriptions of the Law	148
	(d) To Bring out a "Moral" for Conduct	150
	(e) To Present a Maxim or Some Point of Doctrine	153
	(f) To Clarify Another Text of Scripture	154
	(g) To "Elucidate" Historical Events or to "Characterise" Famous People	155
	(h) Anecdotes Concerning Contemporary Personalities	156
	(i) Folklore	157
	(j) Miscellaneous	157
4.	Those Hebrew Roots for which More than One <u>al-Tiqre</u> Formula is Attested	158
5.	Personalities to whom the Use of this Formula is Attributed	160
6.	Comparison between the Two Phenomena of <u>Tiqqune</u>	

	<u>Sopherim</u> and <u>al-Tigre</u>	162
CHAPTER 5	DOES "EUPHEMISM EQUAL EMENDATION"? AN INVESTIGATION OF SOME USES OF EUPHEMISM AND OTHER OBLIQUE OR SUBSTITUTE EXPRESSIONS IN THE TALMUD, MIDRASHIM AND BIBLE	167
1.	Preliminary Questions and Observations	167
	(a) The Terms <u>Tiqqen/Tiqqun</u> and <u>Kinnah/Kinnuy</u> as Referring to the Traditional Lists	167
	(b) The Broader Relationship between the Phenomenon of <u>Tiqqune</u> <u>Sopherim</u> and the Use of "Euphemism" in General	168
	(c) Definition of Terms:	
	(i) <u>Tiqqune/Kinnuye Sopherim</u>	169
	(ii) <u>Kinnuy</u>	169
	(iii) Original "Euphemism"	170
	(iv) Secondary "Euphemism"	170
2.	Some Uses of Euphemism and Other Oblique or Substitute Expressions in Rabbinic Writings	171
	(i) Avoidance of the Direct Implication of the Speaker or Other Types of Oblique Expression	173
	(ii) Substitutes for the Name of God and Other Measures to Protect Divine Transcendence	174
	(iii) The Expressions, "the Enemies of" and "the Haters of" as Euphemistic Devices	176
	(iv) The Expression, "to Bless" in Place of "to Curse"	177
	(v) Delicacy in the Use of Terms Referring to Death, Sickness and Other Infirmities	178
	(vi) Euphemisms for Various Aspects of Sexuality and Other Bodily Organs and Functions	178
3.	Some Uses of Euphemism and Other Oblique or Substitute Expressions and Some Problems Raised thereby for Textual Criticism	179
	(i) Avoidance of the Direct Implication of the Speaker and Other Types of Oblique Expression	179
	(ii) Substitutes for the Name of God and Other Measures to Protect Divine Transcendence	182
	(iii) The Expression, "the Enemies of" as a Euphemistic Device	183
	(iv) The Expression, "to Bless" in Place of "to Curse"	191
4.	Conclusions	195
CHAPTER 6	AN EXAMINATION OF CERTAIN BIBLICAL VERSES WHICH ILLUSTRATE WITH REASONABLE CERTITUDE THAT THEOLOGICAL CORRECTIONS DID REALLY TAKE PLACE	197

1.	"Seeing the Face of God" or "Appearing before God"? Ex 23:15 and Parallels	197
2.	Further Textual Changes so that God is no longer the Direct Agent or Object in a Phrase	204
	(a) 2 Samuel 12:9	204
	(b) 1 Samuel 2:17	206
	(c) Isaiah 48:11	207
	(d) Job 34:6	209
3.	Demythologisation of Various Kinds	211
	(a) Deuteronomy 32:8	211
	(b) The Alteration of Certain Types of Compound Proper Names	214
	(i) Jerubbaal/Jerubbesheth	214
	(ii) Ishbaal/Eshbaal/Ishbosheth	216
	(iii) Mephibaal/Mephibosheth	221
	(iv) Eliada/Beeliada/Baaliada	223
4.	Changes which Pertain to:	
	(a) God's Chosen Ones	225
	1 ^o Moses: Judges 18:30	225
	2 ^o David: 2 Samuel 5:8	230
	3 ^o Solomon: 1 Kings 10:8	232
	4 ^o Elijah: 1 Kings 19:3	234
	(b) Less Desirable People	234
	(c) Temple and Worship	237
5.	Conclusions	240
CHAPTER 7	GENERAL CONCLUSIONS	245
BIBLIOGRAPHY		251
A.	Textual Sources	251
	1. Biblical Texts	
	2. Rabbinic Texts	252
B.	Other Works	255
C.	Manuscripts	268
INDICES		269
	Index of Authors	269
	Index of Biblical Quotations	272
	Index of Talmudic Quotations	279

F O R E W O R D

The present study represents a slightly shorter form of a doctoral dissertation which was defended in the University of Fribourg in June 1980. This dissertation derived its first impulse from seminar work in textual criticism and rabbinic traditions in this same University during 1969-1972.

I would like to acknowledge my great indebtedness to Professor Dominique Barthélemy, O.P., for the interest he has taken and the guidance he has provided at all stages in the preparation of this work. His availability at all times and the resources of his personal library have been of invaluable help.

Special thanks are due further to His Grace, the Archbishop of Dublin, the Most Reverend Dr. Dermot Ryan, who first introduced me to Semitic Studies in University College Dublin, and to Dr. Adrian Schenker, O.P., both for his translation of al-Qirqisani's treatment of the Tiqqune Sopherim and for his many helpful suggestions and observations.

It is also my pleasant duty to offer special thanks to the members of my community for their support and encouragement, in particular to my superior general, Mother M. Josephine, and to Sr. M. Regina, President of Our Lady of Mercy College, Blackrock, Co. Dublin, who generously arranged for me to have sabbatical leave for the completion of this study.

It is not possible to record all the assistance received from family and friends. However, the generous and skilful help rendered by Ms Sheila Cleary in the typing of the manuscript, together with the patient reading and correcting of the finished draft undertaken by Dr. Kevin J. Cathcart and Sr. M. Assisium deserve special mention. The warm hospitality and friendship of the Gemeinschaft der Laien-Missionarinnen made my sojourn in Fribourg a very happy one.

Finally, I am particularly thankful to Professors Othmar Keel and Bernard Trémel for accepting this book for their Series, *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis*, and gratefully acknowledge the contributions towards the cost of publication made by this Series and by Fribourg University Council.

Dublin, July 16th 1980

Sr. Carmel McCarthy, R.S.M.

A B B R E V I A T I O N S

<u>AB</u>	<u>The Anchor Bible</u> , New York.
<u>AnBibl</u>	<u>Analecta Biblica</u> , Rome.
<u>ANET</u>	<u>Ancient Near Eastern Texts</u> , J. Pritchard, Princeton 1950.
<u>ATD</u>	<u>Das Alte Testament Deutsch</u> , Göttingen.
<u>BASOR</u>	<u>The Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</u> , New Haven, Baltimore.
<u>BC</u>	<u>Biblischer Kommentar Über das Alte Testament</u> , Leipzig.
<u>BetM</u>	<u>Beth Miqra</u> , Jerusalem.
<u>BHK</u>	<u>Biblia Hebraica</u> , edited by R. Kittel and P. Kahle, Stuttgart 1937 (3rd ed.).
<u>BHS</u>	<u>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</u> , edited by K. Elliger and W. Rudolph, Stuttgart 1967-77.
<u>BK</u>	<u>Biblischer Kommentar</u> , Altes Testament, Neukirchen.
<u>BO</u>	<u>Biblica et Orientalia</u> , Rome.
<u>BTal</u>	The Babylonian Talmud.
<u>BThB</u>	<u>Biblical Theology Bulletin</u> , New York.
<u>CBQ</u>	<u>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</u> , Washington.
<u>CSEL</u>	<u>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</u> .
<u>DBSup</u>	<u>Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément</u> , Paris.
<u>EB</u>	<u>Etudes Bibliques</u> , Paris.
<u>EH</u>	<u>Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament</u> , Münster.
<u>EJ</u>	<u>Encyclopaedia Judaica</u> , Jerusalem 1974 (3rd ed.).
<u>EstB</u>	<u>Estudios Biblicos</u> , Madrid.
<u>HAT</u>	<u>Handbuch zum Alten Testament</u> , Tübingen.
<u>HK</u>	<u>Handkommentar zum Alten Testament</u> , Göttingen.
<u>HOTTP</u>	<u>The Hebrew Old Testament Text Project. Preliminary and Interim Report</u> , United Bible Societies, London-Stuttgart-New York.
<u>HSAT</u>	<u>Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments</u> , Bonn.
<u>HSM</u>	<u>Harvard Semitic Monographs</u> .
<u>HTHR</u>	<u>Harvard Theological Review</u> , Harvard, Cambridge, Mass.
<u>HUCA</u>	<u>Hebrew Union College Annual</u> , Cincinnati.
<u>ICC</u>	<u>International Critical Commentary</u> , Edinburgh.
<u>IDBSup</u>	<u>Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Supplementary Volume</u> , Nashville 1976.

J	<u>La Sainte Bible, traduite en français sous la direction de l'Ecole Biblique de Jérusalem, nouvelle édition, Paris 1973.</u>
JAOS	<u>The Journal of the American Oriental Society, New Haven.</u>
JBL	<u>Journal of Biblical Literature, Philadelphia.</u>
JE	<u>The Jewish Encyclopedia, New York 1925.</u>
JJS	<u>The Journal of Jewish Studies, London.</u>
JNES	<u>Journal of Near Eastern Studies, Chicago.</u>
JpTh	<u>Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie, Braunschweig.</u>
JQR	<u>Jewish Quarterly Review, Philadelphia.</u>
JSJ	<u>Journal for the Study of Judaism, Manchester.</u>
JThS	<u>The Journal of Theological Studies, Oxford.</u>
KAT	<u>Kommentar zum Alten Testament, Göttersloh.</u>
KeH	<u>Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament, Leipzig.</u>
KHC	<u>Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament, Tübingen.</u>
L	<u>Die Bibel oder die ganze Heilige Schrift des Alten und Neuen Testaments nach der Uebersetzung Martin Luthers, 3. Aufl. Stuttgart 1971.</u>
LXX	<u>The Septuagint.</u>
MGWJ	<u>Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums, Breslau.</u>
MS/MSS	<u>Manuscript/Manuscripts.</u>
MT	<u>Masoretic Text.</u>
NEB	<u>The New English Bible, The Old Testament, Oxford 1970.</u>
OBO	<u>Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis, Fribourg and Göttingen.</u>
Osty	<u>La Bible. Traduction française sur les textes originaux par Emile Osty avec la collaboration de Joseph Trinquet, Paris 1973.</u>
OTL	<u>Old Testament Library, London.</u>
OTS	<u>Oudtestamentische Studien, Leiden.</u>
Pleiade	<u>La Bible. Ancien Testament. Edition publiée sous la direction d'Edouard Dhorme, Paris 1956, 2 Volumes.</u>
PTal	<u>The Palestinian or Jerusalem Talmud.</u>
RB	<u>Revue Biblique, Paris.</u>
RechSR	<u>Recherches de Science Religieuse, Paris.</u>
REJ	<u>Revue des Etudes Juives, Paris.</u>
RSO	<u>Rivista degli Studi Orientali, Rome.</u>
RSV	<u>The Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version, New York 1952.</u>
SC	<u>Sources Chrétiennes, Paris.</u>
TOB	<u>Traduction Oecuménique de la Bible, Edition Intégrale. Ancien Testament, Paris 1975.</u>

<u>VThB</u>	<u>Vocabulaire de Théologie Biblique, Paris.</u>
<u>VT</u>	<u>Vetus Testamentum, Leiden.</u>
<u>VTs</u>	<u>Vetus Testamentum Supplements, Leiden.</u>
<u>ZAW</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, (Giessen) Berlin.</u>
<u>ZDMG</u>	<u>Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Wiesbaden.</u>

I N T R O D U C T I O N

The tradition of the "Eighteen" Tiqqune Sopherim (Scribal Emendations), as attested in certain Masoretic lists, gives the impression of being a very useful item of information for the textual critic. Indeed, many have accepted the tradition on face value, without raising some fundamental questions as to its origin and reliability (cf. Chapter 1). The present study is an attempt to provide a critical evaluation of this tradition, with regard to its origins and development as a whole (Chapter 2), and with particular regard to the individual verses which make up the "eighteen" scribal emendations. Each so-called tiqqun is examined in detail with a view to determining whether it was genuinely emended; and for each case, some attempt is made to discover how it became a tiqqun (Chapter 3). Throughout this study the use of the term tiqqun/e sopherim will be reserved solely for those cases which figure in the traditional lists (cf. the chart on p.55 below).

This tradition of so-called scribal emendations took shape in an atmosphere that was particularly conscious of the need both to protect the sacred text and to interpret it suitably for succeeding generations. Consequently, in order to understand how a tradition of scribal emendations could emerge, it is necessary to examine certain typical ways of interpreting the text, which were current in contemporary midrashic circles, particularly those associated with the al-tiqre exegetical device (Chapter 4).

Since the tiqqune sopherim were understood to be emendations undertaken for theological motives, it is also necessary to examine the whole area of euphemistic and other oblique or substitute expressions, both those which may be considered as original in the biblical text (Chapter 5), as well as those which appear to have been superimposed upon the biblical text at a later period, so as to have it in keeping with a more refined theological outlook (Chapter 6). This examination of the use of euphemism, etc., in the biblical text, of necessity, requires a parallel study of euphemistic expression in talmudic and midrashic literature (Chapter 5).

Secondary euphemisms, or theological corrections, in the biblical text may be seen as parallel to those of the tiqqune sopherim which may be considered as authentic. They can provide some idea of the extent and nature of the emendatory initiative which flourished during a certain period in the history of the transmission of the biblical text (Chapter 6).

The aim of this study, therefore, is to examine whether, and to what extent, the basic intuition underlying the tiqqune sopherim is accurate (i.e., whether the scribes and/or similar custodians of the sacred text did actively emend certain texts for theological motives) and to see to what extent such corrective initiative can be further supported and illustrated by other theological corrections.

C H A P T E R 1

THE PROBLEM STATED - SOME MODERN AND CONTEMPORARY OPINIONS

Exploring the maze of critical apparatus attached to either BHS¹ or to BHK,² the neophyte will inevitably stumble across the siglum, Tiq soph. This, the introductory section tells him, is a reference to one of the tiqqune sopherim, or "emendations of the scribes". He will notice that where the critical apparatus of either edition uses the siglum, it also supplies an alternative reading, indicating what the original text contained before it underwent correction. At least this is the explanation furnished by Würthwein's Der Text des Alten Testaments, which sets out to be an introduction to BHK.³

Thus, the tiqqune sopherim refer to a list of eighteen passages in the MT which have undergone emendation for theological motives. This is the usual explanation given, and at first sight it would seem to provide invaluable information for the textual critic. However, closer examination reveals a number of problems. The more recent and fuller Masoretic lists do not always agree on the number of passages, nor on the passages listed,

-
- 1 K. Elliger and W. Rudolph, Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Stuttgart 1967-77.
 - 2 R. Kittel and P. Kahle, Biblia Hebraica. Stuttgart 1937 (3rd ed.).
 - 3 E. Würthwein, Der Text des Alten Testaments, eine Einführung in die Biblia Hebraica von Rudolf Kittel. Stuttgart 1963 (2nd ed.), p.24. Eighteen emendations are listed here: Gen 18:22; Num 11:15; Num 12:12; 1 Sam 3:13; 2 Sam 16:12; 2 Sam 20:1; 1 Kings 12:16; 2 Chron 10:16; Jer 2:11; Ez 8:17; Hos 4:7; Hab 1:12; Mal 1:12; Ps 106:20; Job 7:20; Job 32:3; Lam 3:20. In the most recent edition of this book (1973), the author refers to the publication of BHS, and shortens the sub-title to: Eine Einführung in die Biblia Hebraica. He also lists Mal 1:13 instead of Mal 1:12. The critical apparatus of BHK contains the siglum and "original reading" for all the above listed passages except for five cases, 2 Sam 16:12; Hos 4:7; and the three parallels in 2 Sam 20:1; 1 Kings 12:16 and 2 Chron 10:16. The critical apparatus of BHS contains the siglum for the same set of passages in addition to Hos 4:7, also omitting it for four of the five above mentioned passages; in addition, it transfers the siglum from Mal 1:12 to Mal 1:13, which, in fact, is cited in all the early lists, as well as later Masoretic lists, whereas Mal 1:12 only appears in certain later Masoretic lists. See below, pp.55-57 for fuller details.

while the earlier lists are not only much shorter, but there is a certain ambiguity in the expression used to describe them (kinnah, "to use a substitute, to express euphemistically").⁴ Finally, the lists which provide "original readings" do not always attest the same one for a given biblical passage.

But if the neophyte is puzzled by this phenomenon, he will be comforted to know that many others have been puzzled before him. For down through the centuries, from the days when the rabbinic discussions related in the tannaitic sources were in full swing, right up to the present day, there have been many attempts to explain and interpret the tiqqune sopherim.

-
- 4 The verb kinnah may be translated in simplest and most neutral terms as "to use a substitute (name or expression)", and the substantive kinnuy may be rendered as "a substitute name or expression". The immediate context further determines whether the use of this "substitute" is
- (a) euphemistic, i.e., having as its purpose the softening of the original idea, whether for theological motives as in these early sources for the tradition in the Siphre and Mekhilta (cf. W. Bacher, Die Exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditions-literatur. Leipzig 1899-1905, Vol. 1, pp.83-85) and in Soṭa 38a and Sanhedrin 56a (see below, pp.175ff.), or for motives of delicacy as in Megilla 25a-b (see below, pp.173ff.), or of "superstition" as in Shebu'oth 36a (see below, pp.173-74).
 - (b) dysphemistic, i.e., having as its purpose the substitution of an offensive or disparaging term for one which is either less offensive or inoffensive (cf. Baba Meši'a 58b; Megilla 27b; Temura 28b; 'Aboda Zara 45b; see below, pp.167ff; pp.216ff. and pp.234ff.).
 - (c) neutral, e.g., "to give a surname to" (cf. Baba Meši'a 58b; cf. Is 45:4).

In this study, in the context of the traditional lists, the verb kinnah and the substantive kinnuy have been interpreted in the sense of "to use a euphemism", since the motivation underlying the "substitution" in the lists is clearly theological (i.e., certain potentially blasphemous and irreverent expressions are softened or "modified" for theological reasons). Some further uses of these terms, kinnah and kinnuy, apart from the traditional lists, are also euphemistic in intent and purpose, while others are dysphemistic (see below, pp.167ff.). To the extent that the ultimate purpose underlying dysphemism and certain other oblique idioms and forms of circumlocution is either directly or indirectly connected with the preservation of due respect for God and/or his chosen ones, it has been possible in Chapters 5 and 6 below to retain the term "euphemism" and to extend its use to cover these related phenomena, without limiting its meaning to kinnuy. In other words, the term "euphemism", from Chapter 5 onwards, covers a broader

The problem may be introduced simply as follows: in rabbinic literature and later in both Masoretic traditions and medieval exegetical commentaries, there exist allusions to the fact that certain verses in Scripture now present a textual form other than that which was either originally written or which was originally intended. That this fact was associated with the scribes is generally accepted, but in what precisely their contribution consisted, and at what period of textual transmission or stabilisation their intervention took place is another question. In fact, difficulties multiply as soon as one attempts to probe any further, for certain sources for the tradition consider that the work of the scribes consisted in the deliberate alteration or emendation (tiqgen, "to emend") of the original text, while other sources seem to imply that the text was never emended, but was written "euphemistically" (kinnah, "to use a substitute") from the beginning.⁵ Within the latter viewpoint, whatever alternative readings are given may be taken as merely indications of what would have been written if Scripture had not expressed itself euphemistically, and not "original" readings, as in the case of the tiqqunim interpretation. Many of the lists stemming from the tiqqunim interpretation include what the original text contained before undergoing emendation, and it is most probably on these lists that the critical apparatus of both BHK and BHS draw when proposing "original" readings. A further complication lies in the fact that there are almost as many different lists as there are sources providing these lists.

Before entering into a detailed examination of this complex tradition,⁶ it is interesting to note that modern and contemporary studies

context than kinnyu, and is chosen in preference to "substitute" because it draws attention to the theological motive at the basis of the substitution.

- 5 These two understandings of what happened to certain biblical verses will be subsequently referred to as the tiqqunim tradition and the kinnyuyim tradition. It must be kept in mind, however, that these are not two totally separate or mutually exclusive traditions, but represent a difference in the interpretation of the phenomenon at various stages in the transmission of the sacred text.
- 6 This examination will concentrate on the origin and development of the tradition until its flowering in the Masoretic lists. Hence, later medieval and post-reformation understandings and misunderstandings of the tradition will not receive much attention, since by this time the tradition was well formed, and these later opinions and discussions do not contribute any essentially new elements to the research. In many instances the resources at their disposal were less than adequate.

of the phenomenon range from total acceptance of eighteen genuine scribal emendations to total rejection of the authenticity of any of them, together with some more nuanced positions which take a middle course. Of those who accept and defend the tradition in its entirety, two names in particular deserve attention, Abraham Geiger⁷ and Christian D. Ginsburg.⁸ Geiger not only accepts that this tradition is totally trustworthy, but is convinced that it is only the tip of the iceberg as far as scribal corrective initiative is concerned:

Der Referent geht nicht von der Absicht aus, diese Stellen aufzuzählen, und noch weniger sie alle erschöpfend anzugeben; sie sind Beispiele für eine Thatsache, die belegt werden soll, bei der es aber genügt, eine gewisse Anzahl derselben beigebracht zu haben.⁹

Although there is a certain element of truth in this statement,¹⁰ one could indeed accuse Geiger of finding far too many instances where the text was supposedly emended.¹¹ Ginsburg's analysis consists in giving a brief account of the main sources for the tradition,¹² followed by a presentation of each of the eighteen classical instances, to which he adds Mal 1:12 and Mal 3:8,9, taken from some of the other Masoretic lists. In each of these twenty cases he accepts that the present MT represents an emended form of an earlier indelicate or inappropriate expression. He, too, would consider that these lists were not intended to be exhaustive,¹³

7 A. Geiger, Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel. Breslau 1857, reprinted in Frankfurt am Main 1928, pp.308-345.

8 C.D. Ginsburg, Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible. London 1897, pp.347-363.

9 Op. cit., p.311.

10 Cf. below, pp.197ff (Ch. 6).

11 The subsection in which Geiger treats of the tiqqune sopherim is entitled Unpassende Ausdrücke (pp.309-345). These expressions are examined in the wider context of Die Reinhaltung des Gottesbegriffes. In the pages from 309-345 Geiger refers to at least eighty-two other passages apart from, and in addition to, the eighteen tiqqune sopherim. While some of these other references may contain theological corrections (cf. Ps 42:3 and 84:8, see below, Chapter 6), many of them have no real textual or exegetical basis for a reading other than the MT. It is worth mentioning that Geiger's work and approach were to have considerable influence in the fields of textual and literary criticism in the first half of the twentieth century.

12 Op. cit., pp.347-351.

13 Ibid., p.362

and like Geiger, whom he cites¹⁴ à propos of Zech 2:12, he devotes a considerable number of pages to the study of

Passages into which changes have been introduced by the authorized redactors of the text, but which are not expressly mentioned in the official Lists.¹⁵

A more conventional and typical defence of the tiqqune sopherim tradition as a whole may be found in the short treatise of Abraham Wedell.¹⁶ He undertakes to demonstrate that the number "eighteen"¹⁷ is genuine and he then proceeds to identify and prove the cases which fit this framework of eighteen, from the different sources available to him.¹⁸ His results are somewhat different from the lists cited by Geiger and Ginsburg and from those cases indicated in BHK, BHS and Wùrthwein.¹⁹

A more scholarly and sensitive treatment of the tradition is presented by Saul Lieberman,²⁰ who is fully aware of the complexity and apparent contradiction between the earlier lists of kinnuyim and the later tiqqunim. He attempts to show that, while the difference in meaning of

14 Ibid., p.359.

15 Ibid., pp.363-367.

16 A. Wedell, De Emendationibus a Sopherim in Libris Sacris Veteris Testamenti Propositis. Breslau 1869.

17 Cf. op. cit., p.10: "Nulla igitur ratione dubitari posse arbitramur, quin octodecim fuerint Scribarum emendationes, cum in textus nostri Masorethici origine et fonte eundem inveniamus numerum."

18 In pp.4-5 of his opusculum, Wedell refers to the following lists: (a) the two lists in the Rabbinic Bible, at the beginning of the Book of Numbers and at Ps 106:20, which both contain sixteen instances (cf. below, p.50f.); (b) he then adds two other cases (not attested elsewhere in the sources used for this present study) from an unnamed source: "et in aliis libris Masorethicis afferuntur etiam loci hi" (Ps 107:18 and Amos 6:8); (c) he refers to the Codex Babylonius at Ez 8:17 and lists the eighteen cases attested there (cf. p.47 below); (d) he quotes from Frensdorff's edition of the Okhlah w'Okhlah (cf. p.43 below).

19 He briefly examines in turn the twenty different instances he has identified from the sources listed in n.18 above, eliminates Ps 107:18 and Mal 3:8,9 as unauthentic, and then presents the remaining eighteen as the authentic tradition (2 Sam 16:12; Hos 4:7; Lam 3:20; Amos 6:8; Mal 1:12; Gen 18:22; Num 11:15; Num 12:12; 1 Sam 3:13; Ez 8:17; Hab 1:12; Jer 2:11; Job 7:20; Mal 1:13; Ps 106:20; Zech 2:12; Job 32:3; 1 Kings 12:16).

20 S. Lieberman, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine. Studies in the Literary Transmission, Beliefs and Manners of Palestine in the I Century B.C.E. - IV Century C.E. New York 1950 (2nd improved edition 1962), pp.28-37.

both expressions should be respected, there came a time when it was necessary that the euphemistic reading be recorded in the text,²¹ and hence his justification of the tiqqune sopherim tradition in the strict sense of the term.²²

Finally, other recent presentations which accept the authenticity of this tradition as a whole include the following authors: B. Roberts,²³ P. Kahle,²⁴ E. Würthwein²⁵ and A. Arzi.²⁶

The other extreme with regard to the understanding of this tradition in modern times has been skilfully and compellingly argued by W.E. Barnes in particular.²⁷ He examines the various midrashic, Masoretic and exegetical source materials and concludes that "the tradition lacks definiteness as to (i) the number of passages affected, (ii) the identity of the passages, (iii) the nature of the change made or supposed to be made in the text."²⁹ His position, therefore, is that the tiqqune

-
- 21 Cf. op. cit., p.36: "As conventions were crystallized, it was deemed insufficient to change only the Keri (i.e. to modify the reading without altering the text); it was a question not of indelicate expressions but of the honour of the Lord. A slight emendation of single letters in the text solved the problem. Everybody knew the meaning of a euphemism, both in the oral and written Law; the alteration did not entirely obliterate the original text."
- 22 Lieberman considers that Num 12:12 is not a genuine alteration or emendation, but a true euphemism; it was Aaron himself who employed a euphemism. Cf. op. cit., pp.32-33. He describes the other seventeen as "euphemistic alterations".
- 23 B. Roberts, The Old Testament Text and Versions. The Hebrew Text in Transmission and the History of the Ancient Versions. Cardiff 1951, pp.34-35.
- 24 P. Kahle, "Die masoretische Ueberlieferung des hebräischen Bibeltextes" in Bauer-Leander's Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments. Halle 1922 (reprinted in Hildesheim 1966), pp.76-77.
- 25 See above, n.3.
- 26 A. Arzi, "Tiqqun Soferim" in EJ, Vol. 15, pp.1139-40.
- 27 W.E. Barnes, "Ancient Corrections in the Text of the Old Testament", JThS 1 (1899-1900) 387-414.
- 28 Op. cit., p.387.
- 29 Ibid., p.402.

sopherim tradition belongs "rather to Midrash than to Masorah"³⁰ and that in spite of the protests of "scholars like Aben Ezra, Ben Asher and Ben Addereth", once the list was "placed among the traditions of Masorah" it continued to be misunderstood and "the effects of the mistake are with us today".³¹

A more nuanced approach as to the authenticity of the tradition as a whole may be found in the following writers: C. Levias,³² D. Barthélemy,³³ W. McKane³⁴ and the present writer.³⁵ While there may be disagreement on various individual points in the interpretation of specific passages,³⁶ this middle view would hold that the authenticity of the tradition as a whole must not be accepted uncritically and that the evidence for the existence of a genuine emendation in any of the passages listed must be thoroughly investigated.³⁷ A recent study of B.E. Nielsen,³⁸ while very comprehensive in arranging much primary and secondary source material dealing with the tikkune sopherim traditions, unfortunately does not offer much critical judgment as to the nature and authenticity of the tradition as a whole or in its component parts.

This brief survey of some recent and modern studies concerning the tikkune sopherim tradition should give a forewarning that this is not a simple tradition, which can be inserted casually, without further explanation, into the critical apparatus of the most recent standard edition

30 Ibid., p.402: "The tikkun tradition belongs rather to Midrash than to Masorah, i.e. its true bearing is on exegesis, not on textual criticism; the tikkune sopherim are interpretations, not readings."

31 Ibid., p.414.

32 C. Levias, "Masorah" in JE, Vol. 8, pp.366-7.

33 D. Barthélemy, "Les Tikkuné Sopherim et la Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament", VT 9 (1963) 285-304 (reprinted and updated in Etudes d'Histoire du Texte de l'Ancien Testament (OBO), Fribourg/Göttingen 1978, pp.91-110).

34 W. McKane, "Observations on the Tikkune Sopherim" in On Language, Culture and Religion in honour of Eugene Nida. Hague 1974, pp.53-77.

35 C. McCarthy, "Emendations of the Scribes" in IDBSup, pp.263-264.

36 I do not agree, for example, with W. McKane's interpretation of Ez 8:17 as a genuine emendation. Cf. op. cit., pp.71-75, and see below, p.91f.

37 Cf. D. Barthélemy, op. cit., p.294; McKane, op. cit., p.66; C. McCarthy, op. cit., pp.263-64.

38 B.E. Nielsen, "Tikkune Sopherim", unpublished mémoire for M.A. at Union Theological Seminary, New York 1977.

of the Hebrew Bible.³⁹ The following chapters will investigate the tradition as thoroughly as possible, in the interests of providing some critical justifications for the value of this tradition in the fields of textual criticism and biblical interpretation.

39 See above, nn.1-3.

CHAPTER 2

ANALYSIS OF THE MAIN SOURCES
ATTESTING THE TRADITION OF SCRIBAL EMENDATIONS(a) The Earliest Lists and their Contexts

The first traces of "lists" recording scriptural verses which contain kinnuyim are found in the Mekhilta of Rabbi Ishmael at Ex 15:7¹ and in the Siphre on Numbers at 10:35,² both tannaitic Midrashim, associated with the school of Rabbi Ishmael. Since neither work in its present form seems to have been known to either Jerusalem or Babylonian Talmud, the dating for the arranging and editing of both of these Midrashim is usually placed some time after the end of the fourth century, A.D.³ The traditions recorded within them are considerably older, going back to the second and third generation tannaim. Since it is not possible to determine with certitude which of the two Midrashim in their final forms is the earlier, what follows here refers only to the two passages in question, in an attempt to clarify the relationship between the two lists.

Both lists appear in the immediate context of an extension to Zech 2:12, which is interpreted, according to a logion of Rabbi Judah ben Ilay⁴ as referring to God's eye:

-
- 1 Cf. H.S. Horowitz, Mekhilta d'Rabbi Ishmael cum variis lectionibus et adnotationibus. Jerusalem 1960, pp.134-135; J. Lauterbach, Mekhilta of R. Ishmael. 3 Volumes, Philadelphia 1949, Vol. 2, pp.42-44; M. Friedmann, Mekhilta de R. Ishmael. Vienna 1870, p.39; I.H. Weiss, Mekhilta zum zweiten Buche Moses. Vienna 1865, pp.47-48. Further editions and MSS of the Mekhilta are mentioned below in n.7.
 - 2 Cf. H.S. Horowitz, Siphre d'be Rab. Fasciculus primus: Siphre ad Numeros adjecto Siphre Zutta. Leipzig 1917, p.81; M. Friedmann, Siphre debe Rab. Vienna 1864, p.84.
 - 3 M.D. Herr, "Mekhilta of R. Ishmael" in EJ, Vol. 11, pp.1269-70, and "Siphre" in Vol. 14, p.1519; H. Strack, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash. New York 1969 (5th ed.), pp.206-208.
 - 4 Cf. W. Bacher, Die Agada der Tannaiten. Strassburg 1890, Vol. 2, p.205. A different version of this logion of R. Judah à propos of Zech 2:12 is also found in the Mekhilta of R. Simeon ben Yoḥai (ed. J.N. Epstein - E.Z. Melamed, Jerusalem 1955, p.2) in another context, without the expression "Scripture has used a euphemism/substitute expression", and without any lists appended. The logion is as follows, after the

And so it says: 'Surely he that touches you touches the apple of his eye' (Zech 2:12). R. Judah says: 'It does not say here: "The apple of the eye" but "The apple of his eye", referring, as it were, to the One above. Scripture, however, has used a euphemism/substitute'.⁵

Then a series of "euphemisms" is listed in each Midrash.⁶ However, the list in the Mekhilta contains ten cases, in addition to Zech 2:12,⁷ whereas the Siphre list contains six⁸ or seven⁹ in addition to Zech 2:12.

citation of Zech 2:12: "R. Judah says, There is no teaching to be derived from waw, but rather from yodh, for everyone who does damage to any man of Israel, it is as if he does damage to the One who spoke and the world come into being". This version of the logion thus hints at an alternative reading with yodh (my eye), and so may be considered as parallel with the kinnuyim interpretation of the other two Midrashim under discussion. See below, pp. 62-63.

- 5 Within the Mekhilta textual tradition, this logion appears in the various editions and MSS in R. Judah's name. Within the Siphre tradition, it is cited anonymously in the Venice edition (1545), and in Friedmann's edition (1864), which appears to reproduce the Venice edition faithfully for this entire passage. R. Judah's name is present, however, in the Codex Vaticanus Heb. 32 (fol. 53a); in BM MS 341 (Add. 16,406), fol. 281a; in the Oxford MS Neubauer 151 (fol. 331b) and in Horowitz's edition (1917), p.81.
- 6 Strictly speaking, it is inaccurate to refer to these series of biblical passages in the early Midrashim as tiqqune sopherim, since this technical term is not found in either Siphre or Mekhilta. It is also entirely absent from the Talmud. Most modern writers do not make this distinction between kinnuyim and tiqqunim, which, as will be seen in the course of this investigation, is necessary. Cf. for example, the recent article by W. McKane cited above on p.23, n.34.
- 7 These eleven cases are present in the following editions: Lauterbach (1949); Horowitz (1931); Friedmann (1870); Weiss (1865); Venice (1545); Constantinople (1515). In the Munich MS 117 (dated c. 1435) 1 Sam 3:13 is missing, whereas in the Oxford MS Neubauer 151, Num 11:15 and Ez 8:17 are missing (see below, n.9).
- 8 The Venice edition (1545), followed by Friedmann (1864), lists six cases after Zech 2:12. So too, the citation from the Siphre made by R. Martin in Pugio Fidei. Leipzig 1687 (2nd ed.), foll. 669-670. See below, pp.52ff.
- 9 Codex Vaticanus Heb. 32, Facsimile edition, Jerusalem 1972, p.105 (fol. 53a), followed by Horowitz (1917), lists seven cases after Zech 2:12, the additional one being Jer 2:11. The MSS BM 341 and Oxford Neubauer 151 do not contain Jer 2:11, but they are also defective in other cases (Ps 106:20 and Num 11:15 are missing in BM 341, Job 7:20 is missing in Neubauer 151). The absence of one or other case in the MSS traditions in itself need not necessarily be significant, since the framework within which the cases are listed makes it very easy for haplography to occur. However, the absence of Jer 2:11 from part of the Siphre textual tradition will be taken up further below, see n.13.

SIPHRE at 10:35			MEKHILTA at 15:7		
1	Zech 2:12		1	Zech 2:12	1
			1a	Mal 1:13	2
			1b	1 Sam 3:13	3
2	Job 7:20		2	Job 7:20	4
3	Ez 8:17		3	Ez 8:17	9*
4	Hab 1:12		4	Hab 1:12	5
5	Ps 106:20		5	Ps 106:20	6
6	Num 11:15		6	Num 11:15	7
			6a	2 Sam 20:1	8
7	Jer 2:11		7	Jer 2:11	10
8	Num 12:12 ¹⁰		8	Num 12:12	11

The above chart records the lists in the sequence in which they occur in the two Midrashim. Only Ez 8:17* is listed out of sequence in the chart (no. 9*) for the Mekhilta list; the number on the right indicates its original position in that list. The eight cases of the Siphre are so listed that comparison with the Mekhilta list shows at what point the other three cases occur. It will be noticed that the overall sequence in both is sufficiently parallel as to warrant the obvious question: is the Siphre list an abbreviated form of the Mekhilta list, or is the Mekhilta list an expansion of the Siphre?

At first sight, it would appear that the Mekhilta represents the more basic tradition, since both lists occur as an expansion of Zech 2:12, which is cited as an interpretation of Ex 15:7: "And in the greatness of your majesty..." In the Mekhilta this exegesis appears to be perfectly in context, as it occurs in logical sequence in that part of Exodus under comment, chapter 15.

¹⁰ Num 12:12 contains a double kinnyu: "Let her not be as one dead, which, when it comes out of its mother's womb, has half of its flesh consumed". Throughout the different traditions, the full verse is sometimes cited, and other times, the first part only. However, in all the early lists it is presented as one case. It is only in some of the fuller Masoretic lists that it is explicitly sub-divided, introduced and concluded separately. Consequently, throughout this study, it will be considered as one case, except in those lists which explicitly treat it as two separate cases.

In the Siphre, however, the list occurs at Num 10:35, and is introduced eventually because Num 10:35 is interpreted by reference to Ex 15:7, together with its subsequent use of Zech 2:12, which in turn entails inclusion of the list. Yet the shorter list at Num 10:35, precisely because it is shorter, still requires some further examination.

K.G.Kuhn's analysis of the relationship between these two passages as a whole can help to throw some light on the relationship between the two lists.¹¹ He identifies in Siphre Numbers an original nucleus, to which later insertions were added. He suggests that this original nucleus has a clear and identifiable structure consisting of five phrases, each of which contains a parallel idea that what concerns Israel also concerns God:¹²

- I He who is against Israel is against God (cf. Zech 2:12);
- II He who helps Israel helps God (cf. Judg 5:23);
- III When Israel is enslaved, God, so to speak, is enslaved with them (cf. Ex 24:10);
- IVa When Israel is exiled, God is in exile with them (cf. 1 Sam 2:27);
- IVb When Israel returns from exile, God returns with them (cf. Deut 30:3).

Each phrase is followed by a "proof-text", included above. Kuhn then describes how this original nucleus was further enlarged with later insertions, expressed in ideas and/or scriptural texts, grouped in units of seven or three. Only the last phrase (IVb) is defective in this respect, containing only one idea based on Song 4:8. Thus, it was immediately after the citation of Zech 2:12 as an illustration or "proof-text" of the first phrase: "He who is against Israel is against God" that the later insertion of the list of seven kinnuyim took place.¹³

11 K.G.Kuhn, Tannaitische Midrashim. Stuttgart 1959, Vol.3, pp.222-227 and Exkurs II, pp.787-792.

12 Op. cit., p.222, n.24.

13 Kuhn outlines the later insertions for the first two phrases in groups of seven, and for the second two phrases, in groups of three (p.222, n.24), sufficiently convincing as to warrant the suggestion that the list of seven together with Zech 2:12 (i.e., eight in all) might be the more representative number for the Siphre tradition, as opposed to the omission of Jer 2:11 in the Venice and Friedmann editions (see above, n.6). At least, it is an attractive solution for the variation within the Siphre tradition, since the significance of the number seven is classical in Judaism. The omission of Jer 2:11 in the other part of the textual tradition could indeed be mere haplography.

When one compares this Siphre tradition with the parallel tradition in the Mekhilta, certain points stand out. First, the Mekhilta at Ex 15:7 records the same sequence of phrases, "proof-texts" and later insertions, with surprisingly little variation, but only as far as the end of the insertions after Phrase II. The rest of this tradition, from Phrase III to Phrase IVb, with their accompanying insertions, is found in the Mekhilta at Ex 12:41, again almost identical with the Siphre version. Secondly, the fact that the tradition is found in one coherent unit at Siphre Numbers 10:35 would now seem to suggest that the Siphre represents the earlier tradition.¹⁴ Yet, the basic fact remains that the tradition is more immediately connected with Ex 15:7, so that it is in a better context in the Mekhilta. That the Siphre passage was taken directly from the Mekhilta passage is untenable on two scores: (a) the Mekhilta passage contains only half of the "original unit", and (b) the later insertions in the Mekhilta passages, although similar, for the most part, to those in the Siphre, are nevertheless more expanded. The clearest instance of this lies in the list of kinnuyim following Zech 2:12, which now contains ten, as compared with seven in the Siphre. It is at this point that Kuhn's hypothesis of an earlier third source, common to both, appears attractive and convincing.¹⁵ He suggests that both traditions have come from an "original nucleus" which was formed around Ex 15:7 (i.e., the five Phrases with their "proof-texts", together with the later insertions after the proof-texts), which was then more freely cited in the Mekhilta than in the Siphre. The redactor of the Mekhilta took that part of the tradition¹⁶ which suited him for the exegesis of Ex 15:7, and used the remaining section at Ex 12:41, whereas the redactor of the Siphre reproduced the entire unit, including the introductory section à propos of Ex 15:7, to interpret Num 10:35.

Even if one were not to accept Kuhn's hypothesis in all its details, it nevertheless takes into account the more developed form of the Mekhilta tradition as compared with the Siphre, while maintaining that the Mekhilta is not directly taken from the Siphre. In what concerns the relationship between these two early lists, the following conclusions may be drawn:

-
- 14 Cf. Kuhn, op.cit., p.790, who points out that from the point of view of language, the Mekhilta passage presents itself as a more recent text.
- 15 Cf. op.cit., p.791.
- 16 The insertions would have formed part of the nucleus before the redactors of either Mekhilta or Siphre used the tradition.

both represent the same basic tradition, but the Siphre list, as it now exists in the Siphre tradition (seven cases in addition to Zech 2:12) may be considered somewhat older than that of the Mekhilta. That the Mekhilta at this early stage represents an expanded list, illustrates in a sort of prophetic way, how this tradition of listing kinnuvīm was destined to undergo further expansion until it finally reached, under another title, an expanded number, also significant within Judaism, namely the number "eighteen".

(b) Citations of these Early Lists in the Yalqut Shime'oni

The next lists to be examined are those contained in the Yalqut Shime'oni, not because this is the next oldest source¹⁷ recording lists, but because, as an anthology dated about the beginning of the 13th century,¹⁸ it records three lists, two from the Mekhilta and one from the Siphre. The list from the Siphre is found at Num 11:15,¹⁹ and is detached from its original context in the Siphre. After Num 11:15 comes the logion of R. Judah on Zech 2:12, followed by the other cases as listed in the Siphre in the same order, except of course, for Num 11:15, which here comes first. The only significant point of interest concerning this list and its relationship to the Siphre tradition is that, as in the case of the Venice and Friedmann editions, Jer 2:11 is also absent.²⁰

The lists from the Mekhilta are found at Ex 15:7,²¹ with its accompanying context, and at 1 Sam 3:13²² with just the bare list, headed with

17 See the sections below which deal with the Siphre Zuṭṭa and Tanḥuma.

18 Cf. M.D.Herr, *op. cit.*, EJ, Vol. 11, pp.1511-1512; H.Strack, *op.cit.*, who notes that in the first edition (Salonica) "the sources of the excerpts are noted at the head of each excerpt, while in the later editions they are placed on the margin" (p.230).

19 Salonica edition (1527), reproduced in Jerusalem 1968, Vol.4, fol.236b; Warsaw edition (1876), Part I, p.480; Oxford MS Neubauer 2637. All three are identical in attesting seven kinnuvīm.

20 See above, n.9 and n.13.

21 Salonica edition, Vol.1, foll.29b-30a; Warsaw edition, Part I, p.151; MS Neubauer 2637.

22 Salonica edition, Part II, Vol.1, fol.21b; Warsaw edition, Part II, p.718; MS de Rossi 1172 (Parma).

1 Sam 3:13, and following the Mekhilta order for the rest. Both lists have one case missing, but a different case for each list. In the Ex 15:7 list, Job 7:20 is missing,²³ whereas in the 1 Sam 3:13 list, 2 Sam 20:1 is missing.²⁴

(c) The Lists in the Siphre Zutta and Midrash Haggadol

The next series of lists to be considered within the tradition of kinnuyim, are found in the Siphre Zutta at Num 12:12²⁵ and Midrash Haggadol, also at Num 12:12.²⁶ Since the Siphre Zutta is only available through reconstruction from later sources, mainly the Yalqut Shime'oni and, to a lesser extent, the Midrash Haggadol, both lists may be taken together. Horowitz notes that he reconstructs this passage at Num 12:12 from the Berlin MS of Midrash Haggadol.²⁷

Like the Yalqut Shime'oni, the Midrash Haggadol is an anthology, compiled from earlier sources, sometime later than the Yalqut Shime'oni, and subsequent to the death of Maimonides (1135-1204).²⁸ The only difference between the two lists is that Job 7:20 is missing from Horowitz's reconstruction of the Siphre Zutta, presumably because it was already lacking in the Berlin MS of the Midrash Haggadol used by Horowitz.²⁹

Otherwise, the list from this tradition comprises ten cases, all of

23 Job 7:20 is missing from both editions and MS 2637. Num 12:12 is also missing from MS 2637. McKane is incorrect when he states that Num 11:15 is missing from the Yalqut Shime'oni list at Ex 15:7 (cf. op. cit., p.54).

24 2 Sam 20:1 is missing from both editions and the MS de Rossi 1172. Num 12:12 is also missing from this MS. The fluctuation in the absence of one or other cases in otherwise reasonably stable lists may be accounted for through haplography, see above n.9.

25 H. S. Horowitz, Siphre d'be Rab. Fasciculus Primus: Siphre ad Numeros adjecto Siphre Zutta. Leipzig 1917, p.277. Also S.Horowitz, "Der Sifre sutta nach dem Jalqut und anderen Quellen", MGWJ 51 (1907) 338-339.

26 S.Fisch, Midrash Haggadol on the Pentateuch, Numbers. Vol. 1. London 1957, pp. 289-290; Z. M. Rabinowitz, Midrash Haggadol on the Pentateuch, Numbers. Jerusalem 1967, pp.194-195.

27 Op. cit., MGWJ 50 (1906) 68 and 51; (1907) 338-339.

28 Cf. Strack, op. cit., p.231.

29 Cf. S. Fisch, op. cit., p.290, n.49.

which are present in the Mekhilta list, the only one which is not present is that of Num 11:15. One further difference from the Mekhilta tradition lies in the fact that the order is different. This list begins with Num 12:12 (since it occurs at this point in the Midrash), Zech 2:12 is listed at the end, together with the logion of R. Judah,³⁰ and the intervening order is quite different.³¹ Another point worth mentioning is that the text of 1 Kings 12:16 is cited instead of its parallel, 2 Sam 20:1.³² Finally, after each case, what would have been written or intended if Scripture had not used a substitute, is added. This inclusion after each case, of what would have been written or intended, marks a further development in the kinnuyim tradition, for in the earliest lists and their inclusion in the Yalquṭ Shime'oni there was only a very rare indication of what would have been originally present if a substitute had not been employed.³³ By the time this anthology had been compiled, the traditional lists of the Siphre-Mekhilta had already undergone both expansion and metamorphosis³⁴ as they were adopted by the Tanḥuma-Yelammedenu traditions. It was possibly as a result of this metamorphosis that each case in the Midrash Haggadol has an indication of what was originally intended.

-
- 30 The appearance of the logion, together with the characteristic "euphemistic" interpretation and formula of introduction for each case puts this list within the Siphre-Mekhilta tradition, even if at this stage the order is disturbed and one of the cases attested firmly in both Mekhilta and Siphre is missing (Num 11:15).
- 31 The order in the Midrash Haggadol list is as follows: Num 12:12; Mal 1:13; Job 7:20; Ez 8:17; 1 Sam 3:13; Hab 1:12; Jer 2:11; 1 Kings 12:16; Ps 106:20; Zech 2:12.
- 32 This is also true of the Tanḥuma and some subsequent sources, including al-Qirqisani.
- 33 Apart from the logion of R. Judah which accompanies most of the lists within the Siphre-Mekhilta tradition, and their subsequent inclusion in the anthologies mentioned above, and which gives a paraphrase of what was intended, only Num 12:12 in the Mekhilta list and in its citation of the Siphre tradition at Num 11:15 in Yalquṭ Shime'oni, carry an indication of what would have been written if Scripture had not used a substitute.
- 34 The Tanḥuma lists, which will be studied in the next section, explicitly use the term tigqune sopherim and give "original" readings for most of the cases.

(d) The Tanhuma Tradition

The name Tanhuma or Yelammedenu does not cover just one homiletic Midrash, with some variant readings or paragraphs, but rather a whole family or type of Midrashim with its own literary genre. As more manuscripts belonging to this tradition are being studied and published, it becomes more evident that it is an over-simplification to speak of the Tanhuma.³⁵ Basically the name Tanhuma refers to Rabbi Tanhuma³⁶ whose name appears in several of the opening discourses. A first edition of one of these collections was published in Constantinople in 1522, in Mantua in 1563, and later in Wilna (Lithuania) in 1831. It is within this collection that a list of scribal emendations (tiqqune sopherim) is included in the exegesis at Ex 15:7.³⁷ Any attempt to date this literary genre of Tanhuma Midrashim has to take into account, on the one hand, the fact that it contains many early traditions. On the other hand, the presence of distinct references to anti-Karaite polemics sets a terminus a quo of 800 A.D. for the editing of the earliest of the extant texts.³⁸

The list in the Tanhuma tradition is significant for a number of reasons:

- (i) it represents a further development of the Siphre-Mekhilta lists in terms of an increased number of cases included in the list;
- (ii) it speaks explicitly of these cases being tiqqune sopherim, but does not give a definite number;³⁹

35 In 1885, S. Buber published an edition based on the Oxford MS Neubauer 154 with references to other MSS in Oxford, Rome, Parma and Munich. This edition differs considerably in the first half from the old printed editions of the Tanhuma, while the second half is mainly similar.

36 Cf. Strack, op. cit., p.131, who describes him as one of the amoraim of the 5th generation (c.350-400 A.D.), whose first attempts at a systematic compilation of the Haggadah makes it plausible that his collections of Midrashim have served as the basic element in the two Pesiqtas and the Tanhuma Midrashim.

37 Constantinople edition, p.70; Mantua edition fol. 32b; Wilna edition pp. 89-90. This list is not present in Buber's edition.

38 Cf. M.D. Herr, "Tanhuma Yelammedenu" in EJ, Vol. 15, p.795.

39 The editions mentioned in n.37 give seventeen cases. Here, as in the case of the Siphre-Mekhilta traditions (see above n.10), Num 12:12 is treated as one case; for the same reasons, namely, it is introduced and concluded as one case, and in some of the Tanhuma MSS traditions (cf. Ms de Rossi 261 and Oxford Neubauer 156) only the first half of the verse is cited. Consequently, McKane's contention that the

- (iii) it supplies, within the biblical verses themselves, the "original" reading for the greater majority of cases.

Each of these facts will be examined in turn in the following paragraphs.

(i) That the Tanhuma list is, indeed, a development of the Siphre-Mekhilta lists is evident from the fact that it is surrounded by the same exegetical context, that of Ex 15:7. The sequence of ideas is basically the same, with slight variations in language. The logion of R. Judah is missing after Zech 2:12, but instead, the "original" reading is given: "'my eye' should have been expressed, but Scripture has used a substitute." Then follows the explanation, "For this is a tiqqun of the scribes, the men of the great synagogue." Then follows the list in the same general manner as in the Mekhilta, except that, as mentioned already, in many cases the "original" reading is present in the biblical text. The chart on the following page should give some idea of the various points at which expansion took place.

The first point at which expansion took place was after Ps 106:20, beginning with the parallel case of Hos 4:7, whereas the second point of expansion took place after 1 Kings 12:16,⁴⁰ beginning with the parallel case of 2 Chron 10:16. The only change of sequence occurs after Num 11:15, which is followed by Num 12:12*, which in the Mekhilta-Siphre traditions occurs last in the two lists. This slight change of sequence does not interfere with the two points of expansion indicated above.

The three editions already mentioned, the Constantinople (1522), the Mantua (1563) and the Wilna (1831), all list the same seventeen cases. The different MSS available for consultation are defective in at least two, and sometimes in more, cases. MSS Oxford Neubauer 2491 and 153 both attest lists of fifteen but vary on one of their omissions;⁴¹ MS de Rossi 261 carries a list of fourteen;⁴² MS Oxford Neubauer 156 attests twelve⁴³ and

Tanhuma contains eighteen, the "canonical" number, together with his criticism of Ginsburg (who cites seventeen cases for the Tanhuma, cf. Introduction, pp.349-50) cannot be accepted as valid (cf. op. cit., p.55). Nielsen likewise appears to follow McKane in subdividing Num 12:12 in all the early lists.

40 1 Kings 12:16 is cited instead of the almost identical parallel text of 2 Sam 20:1 which occurs in the Siphre and Mekhilta. 1 Kings 12:16 is also cited in the Siphre Zutta and Midrash Haggadol in place of 2 Sam 20:1. The same is true for most of the Masoretic lists.

41 Both are defective for Hos 4:7; the former lacks Job 32:3 while the latter lacks Hab 1:12. See below, pp.55-57.

	Mekhilta		Tanhuma (ed.)	
1	Zech 2:12	1	Zech 2:12	1
2	Mal 1:13	2	Mal 1:13	2
3	1 Sam 3:13	3	1 Sam 3:13	3
4	Job 7:20	4	Job 7:20	4
5	Hab 1:12	5	Hab 1:12	5
6	Jer 2:11	6	Jer 2:11	6
7	Ps 106:20	7	Ps 106:20	7
		7a	Hos 4:7	8
		7b	Job 32:3	9
		7c	Gen 18:22	10
8	Num 11:15	8	Num 11:15	11
9	2 Sam 20:1 =	9 =	1 Kings 12:16	13
		9a	2 Ch 10:16	14
		9b	Lam 3:20	15
		9c	2 Sam 16:12	16
10	Ez 8:17	10	Ez 8:17	17
11	Num 12:12	11	Num 12:12	12*

and MS Vaticanus Ebr. 44 contains eleven.⁴⁴ In all these MSS, the cases missing are a mixture of the traditional Mekhilta cases and the new ones witnessed in the Tanhuma edition, and are so varied that no significant pattern of development or dependence may be identified.⁴⁵

⁴² Hab 1:12; Jer 2:11 and Lam 3:20 are missing.

⁴³ Hab 1:12; Jer 2:11 and Lam 3:20 are likewise missing, as well as Hos 4:7 and Job 32:3.

⁴⁴ Ps 106:20; Hos 4:7; Job 32:3; 1 Kings 12:16; 2 Chron 10:16 and Ez 8:17 are missing.

⁴⁵ Once again, the most reasonable explanation for the various lacunae appears to be that of haplography (see above, n.9), or else, that the editions have completed their lists by reference to the different cases in the various MSS, since all seventeen cases are attested in one or other of the MSS with varying degrees of fullness. See below, pp.55ff. for details.

(ii) The root tiqgen, "to emend" appears twice in the Tanhuma tradition. It occurs at the beginning where, in the early Midrashim, R. Judah's name was mentioned, as follows: "For this is a tiqqun of the scribes, the men of the great synagogue", and it occurs again at the end of the list in a verbal form, in relation to Ez 8:17, "They emended 'unto my nose' as 'unto their nose'." It is of special interest then, that the Tanhuma tradition appears to be the first⁴⁶ record of explicit intermingling of a tiqqunim interpretation with the traditional kinnuyim lists of the Siphre and Mekhilta. That each of the cases is to be taken as a tiqqun is shown by the presence in most of them of the "original" reading.

(iii) This "original" reading is present in eleven cases in the three editions.⁴⁷ In the Oxford MS Neubauer 2491, which records fifteen cases, the "original" reading is present for all fifteen cases; the Vatican MS Ebr. 44 does not give any "original" readings, except a paraphrase for Zech 2:12 and Mal 1:13. The other remaining MSS already mentioned attest more or less the same number of "original" readings as the editions, in proportion to the number of cases they contain.

Finally, when dealing with the list in the Tanhuma tradition, mention must be made of the list contained in the Yalqut ha-Makhiri, an anthology of the fourteenth century.⁴⁸ The list occurs at Zech 2:12,⁴⁹ and reproduces, more or less faithfully, the Tanhuma tradition examined above. The list appears in the same order, the only omission being Ps 106:20.⁵⁰ The tiqqunim expression appears at both beginning and end, as in the Tanhuma

46 At least in the records available for study. The next section will examine briefly some of the sources which apply the term tiqqun sopherim explicitly to one or other of the individual verses, but without the lists.

47 In the Mantua and Wilna editions it is present for Num 12:12; 2 Sam 16:12; Jer 2:11; Ez 8:17; Hos 4:7; Hab 1:12; Mal 1:13; Ps 106:20; Job 7:20 and 2 Chron 10:16.

48 Cf. H. Strack, *op. cit.*, p.231, who maintains that R. Makhir "was able to use M. Yelammedenu (Tanhuma) in a form with which neither of the two printed Tanh.-Midrashim squares", a fact which gives this anthology a particular interest.

49 Cf. A.W. Greenup, The Yalqut of R. Machir bar Abba Mari on the Minor Prophets. Vol. 1, London 1913, pp.30-31 (edited from the unique MS BM Harley 5704, fol. 133a-b, which is dated 1514 A.D.).

50 Since Ps 106:20 is present in all three Tanhuma editions, and four of the five MSS referred to above, its omission here is probably due to haplography (see above, n.9).

lists. The number of "original" readings supplied, however, is considerably smaller,⁵¹ yet still more generous than that of the Vaticanus MS Ebr. 44.

(e) Other Explicit References to the Term Tiqqun Sopherim in Passages which do not Contain Lists

If the Tanhuma tradition represents a significant point in the development of the lists, which are now called tiqqune sopherim, there exist, nonetheless, some scattered uses of this term in other passages, some of which must certainly be earlier than the Tanhuma tradition. The following paragraphs will examine some of these explicit references to tiqqune sopherim, which appear without any lists appended.

The first of these references is linked to Gen 18:22, and is centred on a logion of R. Simeon ben Pazzi.⁵² In Genesis Rabbah,⁵³ à propos of Gen 18:22, the logion is simply cited after the biblical verse as follows:

"And they went towards Sodom; but Abraham stood yet before the LORD." R. Simeon said, "This is a tiqqun sopherim, for the Shekinah was actually waiting for Abraham".

This logion is also found in Leviticus Rabbah⁵⁴ in the exposition of Ps 18 as one of the occasions on which the Holy One acted with special courtesy towards Abraham. Three other writings contain a similar interpretation of this Psalm and appear to be drawing on the Leviticus Rabbah tradition,⁵⁵ namely, Tanhuma (Buber ed.) at Bereshith 4,⁵⁶ Exodus Rabbah XLI,⁵⁷ and

51 Original readings are given for 1 Sam 3:13; 2 Sam 16:12; Ez 8:17 and 2 Chron 10:16.

52 An amora of the third generation (c. 290-320 A.D.). For biographical details, see W. Bacher, Die Agada der Pal. Amoräer. Vol. 2, pp.437-53; H. Strack, op. cit., p.125.

53 Cf. ed. J. Theodor and Ch. Albeck, Bereschit Rabba mit kritischem Apparat und Kommentar. 3 Volumes, Berlin 1912-1936, reprinted in Jerusalem 1965, Vol. 2, p.505, par. XLIX,7; ed. A.A. Halevy, Midrash Rabbah. Tel Aviv 1956-63, Vol. 1, p.371; Vaticanus MS Ebr. 60, fol. 92a. In the view of H. Strack, op. cit., p.218: "The Midrash Gen R. cannot have been compiled much later than the Palestinian Talmud".

54 Cf. ed. M. Margulies, Midrash Wayyikra Rabbah. 5 Volumes, Jerusalem 1958-60, Vol. 1, p.224, par. XI,5; ed. A.A. Halevy, op. cit., Vol. 5, p.127. Leviticus Rabbah is generally classified as one of the oldest homiletical Midrashim (cf. Strack, op. cit., p.211) and, like Genesis Rabbah, can be said to predate the Tanhuma compilation.

55 Cf. W. Bacher, Die Agada der Pal. Amoräer, Vol. 2, p.446, nn.2-3.

56 Cf. ed. S. Buber, Tanhuma. Wilna 1885, p.4.

57 Cf. ed. A.A. Halevy, Vol. 4 (Exodus), p.542.

Midrash Tehillim at Ps 18, par. 22 and par. 29.⁵⁸ In all the above four passages, which are contemporary, and in the latter three cases, later than the Tanḥuma lists, the term tiqqun sopherim appears explicitly with Gen 18:22.

The other series of references is linked with Zech 2:12. This time the sources are relatively late, Exodus Rabbah XIII,1⁵⁹ and Yalqut ha-Mak-hiri on Psalms⁶⁰ and Zechariah;⁶¹ the latter two cases are merely reproducing older sources in their tiqqunim dress. The passage in Exodus Rabbah XIII,1 quotes a logion of R. Joshua ben Levi⁶² à propos of Zech 2:12:

R. Joshua says: "This is a tiqqun sopherim, for it was written as 'my eye'."

Although this source for the logion is late, nevertheless its linking of Joshua ben Levi's name with the explicit acknowledgment of a tiqqun sopherim may be indirectly confirmed by the fact that it is by one of Joshua's outstanding pupils,⁶³ Simeon ben Pazzi, that the parallel tradition for Gen 18:22 as a tiqqun sopherim was passed on in the earlier sources outlined above.⁶⁴

The existence of these two logia shows that the term tiqqune sopherim was already in existence quite some time before the Tanḥuma compilation. The next section will provide a further anchor in dating the development of the lists, for it is possible to place the writings of al-Qirqisani within a specific context and period.

58 Cf. ed. S. Buber, Midrasch Tehillim. Wilna 1891, par. 22 and 29.

59 Cf. ed. A.A. Halevy, Vol. 3 (Exodus), p.156.

60 Cf. ed. S. Buber, Jalkut Machiri. Sammlung halachischer und hagadischer Stellen aus Talmud und Midraschim zu den 150 Psalmen von R. Machir bar Abba Mari. Berdyczew 1899, at Ps 110:5, Part II, p.184; cf. MS Neubauer 167, fol.320b. Both read an abbreviated account of the "emendation", in giving the "original" reading and using the verb tiqqen, "to emend".

61 Cf. ed. Greenup, op. cit., Vol. 1, pp.31-32, quoting Exodus Rabbah XLI,4 (Gen 18:22) and XIII,1 (Zech 2:12).

62 Cf. W. Bacher, Die Agada der Pal. Amoräer, Vol. 1, pp.124-94; H. Strack, op. cit., p.120, places him among the first generation of amoraim (c. 210-240 A.D.).

63 Cf. W. Bacher, op. cit., p.130.

64 See above, nn.53-54.

(f) The Tiqqune Sopherim Tradition in "The Book of Lights and Watch-Towers" of Ya'qub al-Qirqisani

Even a brief encounter with the writings of this tenth-century Karaite scholar gives the reader a glimpse into the mind of one who must have been the most formidable champion of Karaism in his day, "thoroughly acquainted with the contemporary Arabic theological, philosophical and scientific literature" and having "a substantial knowledge of the Mishnah, the Gemara, some midrashic works and the Rabbanite liturgy".⁶⁵ His principal work is divided into two parts,⁶⁶ the first of which is the only work of al-Qirqisani to be published in its entirety to date, "The Book of Lights and Watch-Towers".⁶⁷ Chapters 21 and 22⁶⁸ of Nemoy's edition contain al-Qirqisani's treatment of the tiqqune sopherim from a Karaite point of view. Chapter 21 gives a list of eighteen emendations, together with "original" readings, and Chapter 22 sets out the reasons why this theory of emendations cannot be accepted in general, and a more detailed interpretation of the different cases in order to show that the theory is false.

Apart from the fact that this work is relatively easy to date,⁶⁹ its contribution to the study of the development of the tiqqune sopherim is significant in that it represents an approach to the tradition from a different view-point. The fact that al-Qirqisani's list contains eighteen⁷⁰

65 Cf. L. Nemoy, "Kirkisani, Jacob Al" in EJ, Vol. 10, pp.1047-48.

66 The titles of these two parts are refreshing: Kitab al-Anwar wa-al-Maraqib (The Book of Lights and Watch-Towers) which is a systematic code of Karaite law, and Kitab al-Riyad wa-al-Hada'iq (The Book of Gardens and Parks), a commentary on the non-legal parts of the Torah.

67 Cf. L. Nemoy, Kitab al-Anwar wa-al-Maraqib. Code of Karaite Law. 5 Volumes, New York 1939. As yet only some sections of this work are available in translation; cf. L. Nemoy, "Al-Qirqisani's account of Jewish Sects and Christianity", HUCA 7 (1930) 317-97; *idem*, "A Tenth Century Disquisition on Suicide, according to the Old Testament Law", JBL 57 (1938) 411-20; *idem*, "Biblical Quasi-Evidence for the Transmigration of Souls", JBL 59 (1940) 159-68; cf. G. Vajda, "Etudes sur Qirqisani I", REJ 106 (1941-45) 87-123; "Etudes sur Qirqisani II", REJ 107 (1946-47) 52-98; "Etudes sur Qirqisani III", REJ 108 (1948) 63-91; "Etudes sur Qirqisani IV", REJ 120 (1961) 211-57; "Etudes sur Qirqisani V", REJ 122 (1963) 1-74.

68 Cf. *op. cit.*, pp.151-61. For the translation of these two chapters I am indebted to Dr. A. Schenker, O.P., University of Fribourg (CH).

69 Cf. L. Nemoy, who places it in the second quarter of the tenth century (EJ, Vol. 10, p.1047 and JBL 57 (1938) 411.).

70 He lists the different cases, ending with the eighteenth, but makes a mistake in the enumeration between no.7 and no.9, which is righted at

shows that the "classical" number of the Masoretic lists was, by now, already an accepted tradition. His list gives the cases in biblical order, beginning with Gen 18:22, with one or two slight variations in the traditional sequence of biblical books. This marks a contrast with the Tanḥuma list which reflects the order of the early Siphre-Mekhilta lists, but is parallel with the Masoretic lists in that they too, more or less, reflect the biblical order of books. As regards the contents of his list, the most outstanding fact is that al-Qirqisani lists Num 16:14 as a tiqqun, a case not attested elsewhere in the various sources used for this study.⁷¹ The other seventeen cases are exactly parallel with the seventeen listed above for the Tanḥuma editions.⁷² As regards the "original" reading, again, in most cases, it is parallel with that furnished by the Tanḥuma and some of the Masoretic lists for the different cases.⁷³

Chapter 22 is entitled, "Concerning the Explanation of the Falsehood of Their Claim in this Matter".⁷⁴ It sets out to show, by means of fact and logic, that this theory of the Rabbanites is false and indeed "blasphemous"! Al-Qirqisani begins by referring to the tradition of the Rabbanites that the authors of these changes were Ezra and Nehemiah, and that the underlying motivation was the removal of expressions which were vile and offensive to God and the dignity of the Sacred Books. He proposes

no.10 (he attaches no number to 2 Chron 10:16, and then skips from no.8 to no.10, with no record as such for no.9).

71 It is noteworthy that in the latter part of Ch. 22, where al-Qirqisani studies each case in detail, he omits this case. He shows how, in his interpretation, each of the other seventeen (cf. Tanḥuma list) cases are not genuine emendations. Elijah Mizraḥi (c.1455-1526) in his Commentary on Rashi (cf. Warsaw ed. 1862-63), at Num 11:15 (fol. 18b), mentions this verse (Num 16:14) in a general context of kinnuyim, but he does not call it a tiqqun sopherim. His treatment of this same verse in loco (fol. 29b) shows that he considers it to be a true kinnuy (without theological implications). "Will you put out the eyes of these men?" really means "Will you put out our eyes?" But Mizrahi does not use either tiqqun or kinnuy here. Al-Qirqisani's "original" reading for this verse is "thine eyes", which suggests a different (theological?) interpretation. See below, pp.180ff.

72 See above, p.34f.

73 Whatever significant differences occur will be indicated later in the examination of each individual tiqqun in Chapter 3 below.

74 Cf. L. Nemoy, (ed.), op. cit., p.153.

two arguments to refute this theory:⁷⁵

(a) Anyone who would undertake to propose a modification of the Sacred Books, involving the inclusion of a substitute phrase, would be presenting himself as being wiser and more learned than the Prophets who wrote them. And this would be a supreme falsehood. If the authors of these changes were indeed Ezra and Nehemiah, then they would be presenting themselves as being wiser than Moses. And this too would be false. Anyone who would propose to modify a phrase of Scripture would be presenting himself as being wiser than his Creator. There is already a sufficient amount of blasphemy in such a manner of acting!

(b) If it was the desire to preserve reverence for the Creator, through the modification of anthropomorphic and vile expressions, that prompted the writing of a substitute for the original expression, then the one who did this should have removed the expression entirely and not left the substitute, for the substitute expression remains there as a reminder of the original vile expression.

There is no doubt but that there is both skill and sarcasm in the above passages. This same logic is also evident in al-Qirqisani's treatment of the somewhat similar type of tradition, witnessed in the Mekhilta and Talmud,⁷⁶ of the changes introduced into the Greek translation of the Torah so as not to offend the sensibilities of King Ptolemy.⁷⁷ His arguments there are equally succinct:

(a) If these passages were really changed at the inspiration of the Creator, then he would necessarily have changed all passages of this kind, for the Bible is full of anthropomorphic expressions.

(b) Their lying (i.e. that of the Rabbanites) is evident from the fact that these very passages, that they mention as having been changed and altered in the translation, are found current among the Christians, in a form which contradicts their assertions (i.e., in a form agreeing with our text).⁷⁸

75 What follows is a summary of his argumentation, not a direct extract.

76 Cf. PTal, Megilla 71d (this and subsequent references from PTal are taken from the Krotoschin edition); BTal, Megilla 9a; Exodus Rabbah V,5; Mekhilta at Ex 12:40. See further on this tradition in the Excursus, pp.131ff, below.

77 Cf. L. Nemoy's translation in HUCA 7 (1930) 317-97, op. cit.; the passage referred to above is found on pp.358-59.

78 The specific example he gives for this is Gen 1:26, which, he holds, the Christians use to defend their anthropomorphic doctrines.

Thus, this treatment of al-Qirqisani of the now developed and generally accepted tradition of scribal emendations (among the Rabbanites) serves as one further illustration to show that this phenomenon was never without its adversaries and was never fully accepted as a genuine statement of fact.

(g) The Masoretic Lists

This examination of the Masoretic lists will begin with those which are nearest to the Tanhuma tradition and which are best preserved in terms of a complete list of eighteen, rather than with an attempt to classify them with respect to the age of the MSS in question or the sources in which they are attested. At the outset, it should be noted that among the twelve lists about to be discussed, no two are exactly alike in all respects, whether due to variation in length, in cases representing the "eighteen", or in the order in which the cases are listed.

(i) The first three lists may be taken together because they appear to represent the same tradition, with slight textual differences. They are attested in three Yemenite MSS of the British Museum,⁷⁹ BM Or. 1379 (fol. 268b);⁸⁰ BM Or. 2349 (fol. 108a)⁸¹ and BM Or. 2365 (fol. 138b).⁸² In all three MSS the list is given in the Masorah at Num 12:12. The list no.206 in Ginsburg's Massorah⁸³ appears to be a compilation based on these three,⁸⁴ but, in fact, most closely represents Or. 1379. For practical purposes, then, Or. 1379 and Ginsburg no.206 will be taken as one list,⁸⁵ as distinct from Or. 2349 and Or. 2365. The list in Or. 1379 attests the "canonical" number of "eighteen" and each of these eighteen carries either "original" readings or a paraphrase of what was "originally" written.⁸⁶ Comparison

79 Cf. C.D. Ginsburg, Introduction, p.350; idem, Massorah, Vol. 2, p.710.

80 Dated at the end of the fifteenth or early sixteenth century in M.A. Margoliouth, Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan MSS in the British Museum. Vol. 1, London 1899, reprinted in 1965, p.73.

81 Dated 1490 A.D. in Margoliouth, op. cit., Vol. 1, p.65.

82 Dated in Margoliouth as "Yemenite Hand of probably the fourteenth century" (op. cit., Vol. 1, p.52).

83 The Massorah compiled from Manuscripts. London 1880-1905, Vol. 2, p.710.

84 Ginsburg, Introduction, p.350.

85 Cf. B.E. Nielsen, op. cit., p.18f.

86 In this list and in all the subsequent ones, the "original" readings will not be referred to individually. Whatever important differences occur will be mentioned in the subsequent chapter devoted to a study of each individual tiqqun.

with the Tanḥuma lists reveals three points of development:

- (a) the explicit number, eighteen, heads the list;
- (b) Num 12:12 is explicitly presented as containing two tiqqunim; each one is introduced separately; 87
- (c) the order in which the cases appear could be loosely described as being that of the biblical books. 88

The other two lists carry the same heading, but include reference to the fact that these tiqqunim are reputed to have come from Ezra.⁸⁹ They are essentially the same as Or. 1379, with the following slight differences:

- (a) the order for Job 32:3 and Lam 3:20 is inverted, in the case of Or. 2349, when compared with Or. 1379;
- (b) Ps 106:20 is missing from the list in Or. 2365, which otherwise is identical with Or. 1379.

(ii) The next list for examination is that found in S. Frensdorff's edition of the Okhlah w'Okhlah,⁹⁰ a book which, in one form or another, is older than Radaq (1155-1235) who quotes it by name.⁹¹ Not long after Frensdorff's edition, another MS of the Okhlah was identified in the University Library of Halle by H. Hupfeld.⁹² A detailed analysis of the contents of both MSS⁹³ shows that the Paris MS contains much additional material not present in the Halle MS. Amongst this further material may be included the list no. 158 (no. 168 in Frensdorff's edition). The list of

87 See above, n.10. This second case at Num 12:12 completes the Tanḥuma list, making the total eighteen.

88 From Gen 18:22 as far as 1 Kings 12:16. For full details see below, pp.55ff.

89 The heading reads as follows:

... י"ח דבר תיקון סופרים אית דאמרים עזרא ואלון אנון

90 Cf. S. Frensdorff, Das Buch Ochlah w'Ochlah. Hannover 1864, reprinted in New York 1972, p.113, no. 168. Frensdorff's edition is based upon the Paris MS of this work. In the Paris MS this list is numbered as no. 158.

91 Cf. W.E. Barnes, op. cit., p.389. It was mentioned by Abulwalid, by whom it was considered a very important work. It was originally called Ha-Masoreth ha-Gedolah by Rashi and others.

92 Cf. H. Hupfeld, "Ueber eine bisher unbekannt gebliebene Handschrift der Masorah", ZDMG 21 (1867) 201-220.

93 Cf. F. Diaz Esteban, Sefer 'Oklah we-Oklah. Madrid 1975, Introduction, pp.LXXXIX-XCIII. The Halle MS contains 170 lists while the Paris MS contains 349 lists. These 349 lists are further expanded in Frensdorff's edition to 374 lists.

tiqqune sopherim attested in the Paris MS of this work must be clearly distinguished from the work itself. It will be subsequently referred to as "The list attested by the Paris MS of the Okhlah w'Okhlah".⁹⁴

As regards the contents of this list, it is very similar to the three lists just treated. It contains the same eighteen⁹⁵ as Or. 1379 and Or. 2349, but the order is entirely according to the biblical books with the exception of 2 Chron 10:16, which follows immediately upon its parallel case, 1 Kings 12:16. Each case is followed by the supposed "original" reading and is concluded with the expression "but Scripture has used a euphemism". This last phrase is reminiscent of the Tanḥuma integration of the early lists of kinnuyim with the tiqqune sopherim heading and conclusion.⁹⁶ The heading for the list associates the phenomenon with Ezra, as in the case of Or. 2349 and Or. 2365.⁹⁷

(iii) The next list to be examined is that found in the appendix to Baer-Strack's edition of the Diqduqe Haṭṭe'amim.⁹⁸ As in the case of the list appended to the Okhlah w'Okhlah, this list also has the appearance of an appendix. The work itself ends with the preceding paragraph no.56. The contents of no.57 ff. are appended from a different source,⁹⁹ and although the editors indicate in a note on p.44 its possible relationship with Ben Asher and the Masorah Magna at Num 1:1, this in itself is insufficient for the assumption by some modern writers that this list comes directly from Ben Asher.¹⁰⁰

94 The absence of any list in the Masorah of the Erfurt III MS (see below p.51, for details on this MS) could constitute an indirect witness to the secondary nature of this list vis-à-vis the Okhlah, since the Masorah of this MS draws heavily on the Okhlah.

95 These eighteen are the same as the seventeen in the Tanḥuma, with Num 12:12 explicitly divided into two separate cases. See above, n.10.

96 See above, p.36.

97 The heading is as follows: 'ל"ח מלין חקן עזרא וס"י'.

98 Cf. S. Baer and H. Strack, Diqduqe Hatte'amim. Leipzig 1879, reproduced in Jerusalem 1970, pp.44-45.

99 Codex Baer, which, according to the Introduction, p.XXIII, is "aus dem Nachlasse des 1875 in Leipzig verstorbenen Dr.Herm. Lotze zu Leipzig in den Besitz S. Baer's übergegangen". It contains twelve items of apparent Masoretic provenance.

100 Cf. W. E. Barnes, op. cit., p.389; B.E. Nielsen, op.cit., p.21.

It will be referred to in this study as "The list appended to Baer-Strack's edition of *Diqduqe Haṭṭe'amim*."

This list has a number of noteworthy differences from the four already treated. Its title contains the "classical" number of eighteen, but they are called not tiqqunim, but rather kinnuyim.¹⁰¹ However, the list, which is complete with "original" readings, has a short prologue with the following explanation:

There are eighteen expressions (lit. *דברים*) written in the Torah, and they are not written according to their tiqqun, but the wise men of Israel read them according to tiqqun sopherim.¹⁰² They did not emend them, that is to say, erased them and wrote them (again), but our teacher Moses wrote them in the Torah; and what the prophets wrote in the remaining books, they wrote them in a kinnuy form (*על כינוי*). The scribes did not remove from, or add to (them) and they should be called Kinnuye Sopherim. And these are the kinnuyim: (the list of eighteen follows).

This prologue is particularly interesting because, even though it presents the traditional list and "original" readings, it does so while insisting that they are not genuine emendations, but just "euphemistic" expressions, which, in certain exegetical circles, may be "read" according to their tiqqun form for the purpose of interpretation. There is an emphatic denial that these verses were emended, together with the affirmation that they were written in their "euphemistic" form by Moses and the Prophets.¹⁰³

(iv) At this point, the partial list with its prologue, published by B. Keller,¹⁰⁴ should be mentioned. It represents much the same type of tradition as the previous list, but in a less pure form. The list is simply entitled Tiqqun Sopherim. Then follows a prologue quite similar to the *Diqduqe* appendix, but with the following differences:¹⁰⁵

There are eighteen expressions (lit. *דבר*) in scripture... but the wise men of the land of Israel call them tiqqun sopherim...

101 The heading is as follows: *ל"ח מלין כנויי סופרים*.

102 וחכמי ישראל קורים אותם בתיקון סופרים.
The translation of this phrase is hardly: 'the wise men of Israel call them tiqqun sopherim'. See below, n.105, in the fragment T.S.D. 1,61. The text there omits the *beth* before tiqqun, so that the translation there is probably best rendered: 'the wise men ... call them tiqqun sopherim'.

103 This view-point is not unlike that of al-Qirqisani, described in (f) above.

104 Cf. B. Keller, "Fragment d'un traité d'exégèse massorétique", *Textus* 5(1966) 60-83. The fragment is catalogued as T.S.D. 1,61.

and the prophets wrote them in a "binnuyin form" 106 ...

and so they should be called "binnuye of writings" (כינויי כתובים).

The list which follows is extant for the first five cases,¹⁰⁷ and has a lengthy exegesis surrounding Gen 18:22. The "original" reading is present for each of these five cases.

Keller, in his commentary on this fragment,¹⁰⁸ chooses the list of the Paris MS of the Okhlah w'Okhlah as a point of comparison. This was not the best choice, since that list does not contain any prologue, as does the one in the Diquque appendix, and he makes no comment on the unusual form, binnuyin, which appears twice in the introduction. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that the list in this fragment would indeed have followed the list of the Paris MS, for the list in the Diquque appendix omits Ez 8:17 and completes the number "eighteen" by introducing a new tiqqun, namely Mal 1:12, alongside Mal 1:13. It would have been interesting to know how this fragmental list was actually completed.¹⁰⁹

Finally, returning to the analysis of the list in the Diquque appendix, the order here becomes a little scattered after 1 Kings 12:16.¹¹⁰ After 1 Kings 12:16 follows 2 Chron 10:16, as in the Masoretic lists already mentioned, but then there is no further discernible order. Hab 1:12; Mal 1:12 and 1:13 then appear, followed by Zech 2:12 and Jer 2:11 and the omission of Ez 8:17. Hos 4:7 appears at the end, almost as though an afterthought.

105 The differences between the two prologues are underscored.

106 The form, binnuyin/binnuye, which appears twice in the passage seems to be either an accidental or a deliberate misreading of the word kinnuyin, attested in the prologue of the previous list (the Diquque appendix). This fragmental list thus acquires a tiqqunim flavour, through the removal of kinnuyim.

107 Gen 18:22; Num 11:15; Num 12:12a; Num 12:12b; 1 Sam 3:13.

108 Cf. op. cit., pp.82-83.

109 In the light of the above comments, it may be observed that, while there are some points of contact between the Okhlah list and T.S.D. 1,61, these are not sufficient for Keller's concluding: 'La découverte du document T.S.D. 1,61 apporte donc une importante contribution à l'histoire des Tiqquné Sopherim en confirmant une tradition déjà connue par la list 168 du MS de Paris de la Okhla' (op. cit., p.83).

110 For full details as to the order of this list, see below pp.55ff.

(v) The Codex Petropolitanus Babylonicus¹¹¹ is of particular interest and importance, because it is dated c.916 A.D., thereby attesting one of the earliest Masoretic traditional lists.¹¹² Two lists are found in this codex, one at Ez 8:17,¹¹³ and one at Zech 2:12.¹¹⁴ Both contain exactly the same list of eighteen, with a minimum of biblical verse in each case to identify the tiqqun; in many instances the word or words used do not contain the actual word which was supposedly emended. No original readings are supplied, and only the list at Zech 2:12 contains a heading: "Eighteen words, tiqqun sopherim".

Regarding the contents of the lists, there are a number of differences when compared with the Tanhuma tradition and the first four Masoretic lists studied above. Num 12:12 is considered as one case, the first element in the verse is cited only. 1 Kings 12:16 is explicitly divided into two,¹¹⁵ as is also 2 Chron 10:16, which follows immediately. The order does not appear to follow any pattern. Noteworthy is the appearance of an entirely new case: Mal 3:8,9. Mal 1:12 also is featured here, as already noted for the list in the appendix to the Diqduqe. The cases which are not present, because of this different enumeration, but which are attested in the Tanhuma, etc., are 2 Sam 16:12; Hos 4:7 and Lam 3:20. The no.205 list in Ginsburg's compilation,¹¹⁶ although Ginsburg does not explicitly mention the source at this point, is so identical with the Codex Babylonicus, that it has to be the same list.¹¹⁷

-
- 111 This codex has been reproduced in facsimile by H. Strack, The Hebrew Bible - Latter Prophets. The Babylonian Codex of Petrograd. Petrograd 1876, reprinted in New York 1971.
- 112 Fol.224a gives the year 1228, a reckoning according to Seleucid dating, which is the equivalent of 916/917 A.D.
- 113 Cf. the Masorah at the end of fol.127b.
- 114 Cf. the Masorah at the end of fol.212b.
- 115 The repetition of the word "tents" in the text of both Kings and Chron. is explicitly numbered separately.
- 116 Cf. The Massorah, Vol. 2, p.710.
- 117 Apart from the similarity between the two, the fact that Ginsburg frequently cites this codex for many other items in this same work is sufficient reason for this assumption.

A general observation à propos of the lists in this codex is that they are very brief and directly to the point. Another list which represents this particular tradition is cited by Ginsburg in his compilation of Masorah, namely, no.204.¹¹⁸ However, there are a number of small differences between the two lists: the title is the same though written in full, without abbreviation as in no.205. The citation of the different biblical verses is slightly more expanded; the order is different, slightly less at random.¹¹⁹ 1 Kings 12:16 again is divided into two, but the explicit division of its parallel, 2 Chron 10:16 is not mentioned, hence the list in fact only refers to seventeen cases, in spite of the heading which says eighteen. Again, Mal 1:12 and 3:8,9 appear; Num 12:12 is cited only once and 2 Sam 16:12; Hos 4:7 and Lam 3:20 are absent. No "original" readings are supplied.

(vi) The next list for discussion is that appended to MS BM Or. 1425, which contains the MS of the Hebrew Grammar called Ma'ase Ephod by Profiat Duran.¹²⁰ As in the case of the MSS for the Okhlah w'Okhlah and the Diqduqe Haṭṭe'amim, this list too appears to have been included as a sort of appendix. The edition of the Ma'ase Ephod by Friedländer and Kohn¹²¹ does not contain this list. The description of MS Or. 1425 by Margoliouth¹²² confirms the impression that this list is an extraneous element. The MS consists of 116 leaves, of which foll. 1-113 contain an original foliation in Hebrew. There is a lacuna after fol. 113, while foll. 114-116, which have no Hebrew foliation, are the only preserved leaves of the last quire. Foll. 1-113 contain the Hebrew Grammar; foll. 114-115 contain various short pieces, the fourth of which is entitled: Tiqqun Sopherim, Ezra and Nehemiah. This list gives fifteen passages, complete with "original" readings for each case. The order in which the cases appear is strictly biblical for the first eleven cases, the remaining four look as if they were added on afterwards.¹²³ If compared with the Tanḥuma tradition and the first four Masoretic lists examined above, the following differences emerge:

- (a) 2 Sam 20:1 is cited rather than the parallel of 1 Kings 12:16.¹²⁴

118 Cf. op. cit., Vol. 2, p.710, no.104. Unfortunately, Ginsburg does not indicate the provenance of this list either.

119 For the order in these two lists, see below, pp.55ff.

120 Cf. Ginsburg, Introduction, p.351.

121 Cf. J. Friedländer and J. Kohn, Ma'ase Ephod, Einleitung in das Studium und Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache von Profiat Duran. Vienna 1865.

122 Cf. op. cit., Vol. 3, p.297.

- (b) Hab 1:12; Hos 4:7; Ps 106:20 and 2 Chron 10:16 are absent.
- (c) Mal 1:12 is included alongside Mal 1:13.
- (d) Num 12:12 is explicitly sub-divided into two cases.
- (e) The order and number of cases included do not follow either Tanhuma or the first four Masoretic lists examined above.

The tradition represented by Or. 1425 does not, therefore, appear to be parallel, to any great extent, to any of the foregoing lists in the above pages. The same observation may be made for the next two lists to be examined.

(vii) The Paris MS Heb. 1-3¹²⁵ records a very unusual tradition. The Masorah at 1 Kings 12:16 gives a list of thirteen, with the following heading: Thirteen Words, Tiqqun Sopherim. Among the thirteen listed, appears a new one, not attested in any of the other sources consulted for this study, namely Gen 16:5. The other twelve are present in one or other of the various traditions, and appear in biblical order except for Gen 18:22, which comes at the end of the list.¹²⁶ Another interesting feature about this list of thirteen is that in the margin at each of these thirteen verses, there is a Masoretic indication that this verse is one of the Thirteen Tiqqun Sopherim.¹²⁷ The list is given with at least two words to identify each biblical verse, but no original readings are supplied. Comparison with the Tanhuma list reveals the following differences:

- (a) 2 Sam 16:12; Ez 8:17; Hos 4:7; Job 7:20; Lam 3:20 and 2 Chron 10:16 are absent.
- (b) Mal 1:12 is present alongside Mal 1:13.
- (c) The order and number of cases are different.
- (d) No original readings are supplied.

(viii) This tradition of thirteen tiqqune sopherim is also attested in the BM MS Add. 21,161¹²⁸ in the Masorah at Hab 1:12, but is less

123 These last four are 2 Sam 16:12; Lam 3:20; Num 12:12b; Job 32:3.

124 This is more related to the early Siphre-Mekhilta lists which also cite 2 Sam 20:1 and do not mention 1 Kings 12:16.

125 Bibliothèque Nationale. Heb. 1-3; cf. Ginsburg, Introduction, p.765f. The date of the MS is included at the end of Ezekiel in Vol. 2, 1286 A.D. This MS was formerly located in the Jesuit community at Kōln.

126 The thirteen are listed as follows: Gen 16:5; Num 11:15; Num 12:12a; 1 Sam 3:13; 1 Kings 12:16; Jer 2:11 Hab 1:12; Zech 2:12; Mal 1:12; Mal 1:13; Ps 106:20; Job 32:3; Gen 18:22.

127 Only one exception, Mal 1:12 has a marginal note saying that this is one of the Eleven Tiqqun Sopherim!

consistent in its contents than the Paris MS. The heading for this list is again Thirteen Words in Scripture which are Tiqqun Sopherim, but the actual list only contains eleven cases.¹²⁹ Of these eleven cases, Job 7:20 is the only one which is not mentioned in the Paris MS tradition of thirteen; for the rest, Gen 18:22; Num 11:15 and the new case of Gen 16:5 are present in the Paris MS, but are not in this list. Thus, while there are striking similarities between the two lists, particularly in the explicit number of thirteen, and in most of the cases cited in both, nevertheless there are also some striking differences. One further difference between the two traditions lies in the fact that, while the marginal notes for twelve of the thirteen cases in the Paris MS indicate the number thirteen,¹³⁰ in this MS, none of the individual cases cited in the list at Hab 1:12 contains marginal notes. However, at Ez 8:17, which is not present in the list, there exists the marginal note that this verse is one of the Eighteen Words, Tiqqun Sopherim!

(ix) In order to complete this survey of Masoretic lists, the tradition included in the printed Masorah of the Biblia Rabbinica¹³¹ at Num 1:1 and Ps 106:20 will now be examined. Both lists contain sixteen cases,¹³² in spite of the title which they both carry: Eighteen Words, Tiqqun Sopherim.¹³³ No original readings are given, and the order is biblical only as far as 2 Sam 20:1. Comparison with the Tanhuma list shows that the tradition represented here is quite close to it:

- (a) Num 12:12 is cited as one case in both;
- (b) Mal 1:12 is absent in both.

The absence of reference to 2 Chron 10:16 accounts for the difference between the sixteen cases in these lists, and the seventeen in the Tanhuma list. One further difference between them lies in the fact that the Rabbinic Bible lists cite 2 Sam 20:1 in place of 1 Kings 12:16 of the Tanhuma

128 A MS of the Prophets and Hagiographa, dated by Ginsburg, Introduction, p.632f., c.1150 A.D. This MS was formerly known as Ebner 2 (Nürnberg).

129 These eleven cases are listed as follows: Num 12:12a; Hab 1:12; Zech 2:12; Mal 1:13; Mal 1:12; Ps 106:20; Jer 2:11; 1 Kings 12:16; Job 7:20; Job 32:3; 1 Sam 3:13. No "original" readings are supplied.

130 See above, n.127.

131 Biblia Rabbinica. Jerusalem 1972, a reprint of the 1525 Venice edition.

132 The only difference between the sixteen cases in each list occurs at Num 12:12 (the first cites 12:12a while the second cites 12:12b).

133 The title at Ps 106:20 is slightly more expanded.

and most Masoretic lists.¹³⁴

The above paragraphs have given some indication of the complexity and unsystematic nature of the lists attested in certain Masoretic MSS. However, to complete the picture, it should be mentioned that a significant number of the better quality Hebrew MSS of the Bible do not give any, or in some cases very little, recognition to this phenomenon in their Masorah. The Leningrad Codex,¹³⁵ the Aleppo Codex¹³⁶ and MS BM Or. 4445¹³⁷ give no indication whatever, whether by list, or by marginal note, at any of the traditional verses. The Berlin MS Or. fol. 1213 (formerly Erfurt III)¹³⁸ contains no Masoretic awareness of tiqqune sopherim, except one marginal note at 1 Sam 3:13 to the effect that this is one of Eighteen Tiqqun Sopherim. The Vatican MS Ebr. 448 on the Pentateuch contains one indication, at Num 11:15, to the effect that this is one of Eighteen Tiqqun Ezra.¹³⁹ The Madrid MS 1¹⁴⁰ contains two marginal notes at Num 11:15 and Hab 1:12 indicating that both are tiqqun sopherim, but no number is included. The MS de Rossi 782¹⁴¹ contains two marginal notes, one at Num 12:12, indicating that this verse is one of Eighteen Tiqqun Sopherim, and one at 1 Kings 12:16, Eighteen Tiqqun Ezra. The MS BM Add. 15,451¹⁴² contains a similar marginal

134 See above, n.40 and n.124.

135 Dated 1008 or 1009, and considered still "The oldest dated manuscript of the complete Hebrew Bible" (p.XI in the Prolegomena to BHS).

136 Cf. ed. M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, The Aleppo Codex. Provided with masoretic notes and pointed by Aaron ben Asher. Jerusalem 1976.

137 Cf. Ginsburg, Introduction, pp.469-74, who holds that "though not dated, the original manuscript was probably written about A.D. 820-850." (p.469). It is a MS of the Pentateuch with Masorah Magna and Parva.

138 Cf. M. Steinschneider, Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin, Berlin 1897, Vol. 2, p.1, who cites Lagarde as dating it approximately c. 1100 A.D.

139 Gen 18:22 is missing from the MS, and there is no marginal note at Num 12:12. This MS, which also contains the Targum of Onkelos, was written in 1252 A.D. (Cf. S. Assemanus, Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae Codicum Manuscriptorum Catalogus. Roma 1756, Vol. 1, p.405).

140 Cf. Ginsburg, Introduction, pp.771-76. "It is written in a beautiful Sephardic hand and is dated Toledo A.D. 1280." (p.771). It is a MS of the whole Bible.

141 This MS is dated Toledo 1277, and formed the basis for S. Norzi's Minḥat Shai Bible.

142 Cf. Ginsburg, op. cit., pp.605-615, who describes it as a "magnificent MS ... written in a beautiful Franco-German hand c. A.D. 1200. In its present state it comprises the Pentateuch and Prophets with Hagiographa incomplete."

note at each of the following biblical passages: Gen 18:22; Num 11:15; Num 12:12; Hab 1:12; Mal 1:13, to the effect that each is one of Eighteen Tiqqun Sopherim. The Cairo Codex of the Prophets¹⁴³ contains eight marginal notes, at the following passages: 1 Sam 3:13; 1 Kings 12:16; Jer 2:11; Ez 8:17; Hab 1:12; Zech 2:12; Mal 1:13; Mal 3:8,9, to the effect that each is an instance of Eighteen Words, Tiqqun Sopherim and Wise Men. It is interesting to note that while these marginal references are not complete or systematic, the figure "eighteen" recurs with significant regularity.

(h) The Tiqqune Sopherim Traditions in Pugio Fidei of R. Martin

Raymond Martin (c.1222-1285)¹⁴⁴ was a Catalan Dominican, well versed in Hebrew and rabbinic writings. His main work was his Pugio Fidei,¹⁴⁵ which is divided into three parts, the second and third of which are devoted to anti-Jewish polemics. This work marks a development in the Jewish-Christian polemic of his day in that he derives his "proofs" for the truth of Christianity and the falsehood of the Jewish faith not just from the Old Testament, but also from the Talmud and other rabbinic literature. One of the anti-Jewish themes that recurs in this work is that the biblical text was distorted and deformed through the tiqqune sopherim. Pugio Fidei became the most infamous and most widely circulated medieval anti-Jewish work. In the mid-seventeenth century (c.1651) Joseph de Voisin edited this work on the basis of four MSS.¹⁴⁶ A second edition was published by J.B. Carpzov in 1687,¹⁴⁷ to which he added an anti-Jewish preface and biography of the author, R. Martin. It is from this second edition that the observations in the following pages are made.

There are four lists of tiqqune sopherim recorded in Pugio Fidei.¹⁴⁸ One of these lists is presented as coming from the Siphre,¹⁴⁹ and contains

143 Cf. D.S. Löwinger's reproduction, Jerusalem 1971, 2 Volumes, with introduction. It is sub-titled, "The Earliest Extant Hebrew Manuscript, written in 895 by Moshe ben Asher".

144 Cf. B. Sular, "Raymond Martini" in EJ, Vol. 11, pp.1065-66.

145 The Dagger of Faith, c.1280.

146 Cf. J.Carpzov's Introduction in the second edition, p.89. See also the following note, n.147.

147 R. Martin, Pugio Fidei adversus Mauros et Judaeos, cum observationibus Joseph de Voisin et introductione Jo. Benedicti Carpzovi. Leipzig 1687 (2nd ed.).

148 Cf. foll. 222; 243; 548 and 669-670.

149 Foll. 669-670.

seven instances,¹⁵⁰ which are the same as those recorded in the Venice and Friedmann editions.¹⁵¹ But the overall framework within which this list is presented differs in many respects from the text of the Venice edition, and indeed from the other Siphre editions and MSS mentioned above.¹⁵² The most significant difference is that the "original" reading or an equivalent paraphrase is present for each passage.¹⁵³

The list on fol. 548 is presented as a quotation of R. Rachmon (12th century or contemporary?), who, à propos of Lam 3:20, cites R. Moshe ha-Darshan¹⁵⁴ as including a list of tiqqune sopherim in his Genesis Rabbati¹⁵⁵ at Gen 18:22. Then follows a quotation from Midrash Tehillim at Ps 18:36, followed by a list of seven.¹⁵⁶ In all, this passage contains eight in a sequence and manner of presentation not found elsewhere in the sources examined for this study. The words tiqqun/e sopherim are found seven times in the passage, and "original" readings are supplied throughout. The conclusion to the passage refers again to Moshe ha-Darshan, "where many other instances are to be found". It would appear likely, therefore, that Martin is quoting his sources freely and is only giving a random sample of the "many tiqqune sopherim" which he says may be found in R. Moshe's writings.

The list on fol. 243, inserted from the Majorca MS by de Voisin,¹⁵⁷ is presented also as a citation of R. Moshe ha-Darshan. This time, the list begins with Num 11:15, followed by the citation from Midrash Tehillim at Ps 18:36, then ten of the traditional tiqqune sopherim,¹⁵⁸ followed by

150 Cf. above, n.8. See below, also, pp.55ff.

151 I.e., Jer 2:11 is also missing here.

152 Cf. pp.26ff above.

153 Cf. above, n.33. It appears that it was only from the time of the Midrash Haggadol onwards that a systematic attempt to supply "original" readings for each passage was made. It seems likely therefore that Martin has either "edited" the source from which he is quoting the Siphre, in the interests of his polemic, or else he is quoting from the Siphre in a contaminated or otherwise unknown form.

154 An eleventh century scholar and haggadist of Narbonne. Cf. I.M. Ta-Shma, "Moses Ha-Darshan" in *EJ*, Vol. 12, p.429; L. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*. Frankfurt am Main 1892, reprinted in Hildesheim 1966, pp.300-304.

155 A midrashic anthology, probably based on Genesis Rabbah, but expanded and creatively developed.

156 Lam 3:20; Gen 18:22; Num 11:15; Job 7:20; 32:3; Ez 8:17; Hos 4:7; Jer 2:11.

157 Cf. fol. 243.

158 Num 11:15; Job 7:20; Gen 18:22; 2 Sam 16:12; 20:1; Lam 3:20; Ez 8:17; Hab 1:12; Jer 2:11; Hos 4:7; Job 32:3.

Ps 22:17.¹⁵⁹ The words tiqqune sopherim are found twice and "original" readings are supplied for all twelve passages.

Finally, the list attested on fol. 222 is introduced in the context of references to Bereshith Rabbah, Midrash Tehillim and "The end of the Book of Ben Asher which is called Dicduc, and in many other places". The list of thirteen which follows includes twelve traditional passages¹⁶⁰ and Ps 22:17, complete with original readings in each case. Again, as in the preceding lists, the sequence of the passages is unparalleled in the other sources examined above, and the conclusion to this list explains very clearly Martin's understanding of the phenomenon:

Per ista quidem satis patet Judaeos esse falsigraphos,
fures atque mendaces.

This is a rather severe and sweeping condemnation of the care and extreme fidelity with which the Scriptures were preserved and transmitted in Jewish circles. It can serve also as a useful guideline as to the motivation and aim of Martin's work, and consequently as to the accuracy of the tradition which he appears to be quoting rather freely. The value of his use of these lists lies perhaps in the insight given into Judaeo-Christian relationships in his time, rather than in a disinterested objective transmission of the lists as such.

(i) Charts illustrating the Development and Relationships of the Various Lists and Traditions

The following three pages contain charts which illustrate the development and relationships of the various lists and of the MSS available for certain traditions. In each chart, the biblical verses are listed at the margin only, and the number in the corresponding column indicates the position in the list for that particular case. In Chart I (p.55) the isolated cases are listed after 2 Chron 10:16, each one carrying an asterisk. In Chart II (p.56) the tradition represented by the Siphre Zuṭṭa is included for purposes of comparison and contrast, while in Chart III (p.57) the Yalquṭ ha-Makhiri tradition is included for the same reasons.

159 This case appears only here and on fol. 222 in all the various sources consulted for this study.

160 See Chart I on the opposite page.

CHART I

The Main Lists in Outline

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
	Sipbre	Mekhlita	Yalout(Num)	Yalout(Er)	Yalout(1 Sam)	Sipbre Zutta	Mid. Haggadol	Tanhuma	Yalout ha-M.	al-Qirqisani	BM 1379(=G.206)	BM 2349	BM 2365	Okhliah(Paris M)	Diquduq (app.)	T.S.D. 1,61	Bab.Codex(2205)	G.204	BM 1425(M.Eph)	Paris MS	BM Add.21,161	Pugio f.669	Pugio f.222	Pugio f.243	Pugio f.548
Gen 18:22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	13	-	-	1	3	2
Num 11:15	6	8	1	7	10	-	-	11	10	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	-	6	2	1	3
Num 12:12	8	11	7	9	6	1	1	12	11	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	7	-	-	-
Num 12:12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	4	4	4	4	4	-	-	14	-	-	-	-	-	-
1 S 3:13	-	3	-	3	1	4	5	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	11	-	-	-	-
2 S 16:12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16	15	6	6	6	6	6	6	-	-	-	12	-	-	-	6	4	-
2 S 20:1	-	9	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	5	-
1 K 12:16	-	-	-	-	-	7	8	13	12	7	7	7	7	7	7	-	8	5	-	5	8	-	7	-	-
Jer 2:11	7	6	-	5	7	6	7	6	5	13	12	12	12	9	13	-	7	8	6	6	7	-	11	9	8
Ez 8:17	3	10	4	10	9	3	4	17	16	9	9	9	9	10	-	-	5	10	7	-	-	3	9	7	6
Hos 4:7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	6	14	13	13	13	11	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	10	7
Hab 1:12	4	5	5	4	5	5	6	5	7	10	14	14	14	12	9	-	6	11	-	7	2	4	10	8	-
Zech 2:12	1	1	2	1	2	9	10	1	1	12	11	11	11	13	12	-	18	12	8	8	3	1	-	-	-
Mal 1:13	-	2	-	2	3	2	2	2	2	11	10	10	10	14	11	-	15	14	10	10	4	-	13	-	-
Ps106:20	5	7	6	6	8	8	9	7	-	18	18	18	-	15	14	-	16	9	-	11	6	5	-	-	-
Job 7:20	2	4	3	-	4	-	3	4	4	15	15	15	15	16	15	-	13	16	11	-	9	2	3	2	4
Job 32:3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	8	16	16	17	16	17	16	-	12	17	15	12	10	-	4	11	5
Lam 3:20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	14	17	17	16	17	18	17	-	-	-	13	-	-	-	8	6	1
2 Ch10:16	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	13	8	8	8	8	8	8	-	10	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gen 16:5*																				1					
Num 16:14*										4															
1 K 12:16*																	9	6							
Mal 1:12*															10		14	13	9	9	5				
Mal 3:8,9*																	17	15							
Ps 22:17*																						5	12		
2 Ch10:16*																	11								
TOTAL	8	11	7	10	10	9	10	17	16	18	18	18	17	18	18	-	18	17	15	13	11	7	13	12	8

C H A R T I I

The Siphre and Mekhilta Manuscript Traditions

	S I P H R E						M E K H I L T A			
	Siphre Ed. (Horowitz)	Siphre Ed. (Venice, Friedm.)	Siphre, Codex Vat. 32	Siphre, Oxford Neubauer 151	Siphre, BM 341 Add. 16,406		Mekhilta 5 Editions	Mekhilta MS Munich 117	Mekhilta Ox. Neubauer 151	Siphre Zutta ..
Gen 18:22	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
Num 11:15	6	6	6	5	-		8	7	-	-
Num 12:12	8	7	8	6	5		11	10	9	1
1 S 3:13	-	-	-	-	-		3	-	3	4
2 S 16:12	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
2 S 20:1	-	-	-	-	-		9	8	8	-
1 K 12:16	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	7
Jer 2:11	7	-	7	-	-		6	5	6	6
Ez 8:17	3	3	3	2	3		10	9	-	3
Hos 4:7	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
Hab 1:12	4	4	4	3	4		5	4	5	5
Zech2:12	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	9
Mal 1:13	-	-	-	-	-		2	2	2	-
Psl06:20	5	5	5	4	-		7	6	7	4
Job 7:20	2	2	2	-	2		4	3	4	-
Job 32:3	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
Lam 3:20	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
2 Ch10:16	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
TOTAL	8	7	7	6	5		11	10	9	9

C H A R T I I I

The Tanhuma Manuscript Traditions

	Constantinople, Mantua, Wilna Editions	MS Oxford Neubauer 2491	MS Oxford Neubauer 153	MS de Rossi 261	MS Oxford Neubauer 156	MS Vaticanus Ebr. 44	Yalqut ha- Makhiri
Gen 18:22	10	8	8	8	6	7	9
Num 11:15	11	9	9	9	7	8	10
Num 12:12	12	10	10	10	8	9	11
1 S 3:13	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
2 S 16:12	16	14	14	13	11	11	15
2 S 20:1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1 K 12:16	13	11	11	11	9	-	12
Jer 2:11	6	6	5	-	-	6	5
Ez 8:17	17	15	15	14	12	-	16
Hos 4:7	8	-	-	6	-	-	6
Hab 1:12	5	5	-	-	-	5	7
Zech 2:12	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mal 1:13	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Ps 106:20	7	7	7	5	5	-	-
Job 7:20	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Job 32:3	9	-	6	7	-	-	8
Lam 3:20	15	13	13	-	-	10	14
2 Ch 10:16	14	12	12	12	10	-	13
TOTAL	17	15	15	14	12	11	16

(j) Some Observations and Tentative Conclusions

1⁰ A general line of development can be traced from the list of eight (Zech 2:12 + seven) kinnuyim in the Siphre to the eleven (Zech 2:12 + ten) represented by the Mekhilta. Both these traditions are developed as an extension to a certain understanding of Zech 2:12 in a wider context of "proof-texts", used as illustrations of certain relationships between God and Israel.¹⁶¹ The Tanḥuma list attests the same tradition, but now in a further expanded form, with six new cases inserted in groups of three at two appropriate places.¹⁶² By about this time the number of cases appears to have been reasonably stable, eighteen, as witnessed to by the exposition of al-Qirqisani,¹⁶³ and the later more developed Masoretic lists.¹⁶⁴

2⁰ Furthermore, the lists are no longer classified as kinnuyim, as in the early Siphre-Mekhilta traditions and in the secondary sources which reproduce them,¹⁶⁵ but as tiqqune sopherim, even though sometimes retaining the outward shell of the early sources.¹⁶⁶

3⁰ This subtle change in terminology, however, appears in individual passages, which do not contain lists. These passages can be dated before the tiqqunim indicated in the Tanḥuma and al-Qirqisani.¹⁶⁷ Two biblical verses that are thus singled out in earlier and contemporary passages as being tiqqune sopherim are, not surprisingly, Zech 2:12 and Gen 18:22.

4⁰ What significance is to be attached to this "change" in terminology? Are the two expressions, kinnuyim and tiqqunim referring to the same phenomenon in a complementary fashion, or do they represent mutually exclusive approaches to the interpretation of these biblical verses? These questions will be tackled in the course and at the conclusion of a detailed study of each of the "official" eighteen scribal emendations in the following pages.

5⁰ The above examination of the sources attesting lists of kinnuyim or

161 Cf. above, pp.27-30.

162 Cf. above, pp.33-37.

163 Cf. above, pp.39-42.

164 Cf. above, pp.42-52.

165 Cf. above, pp.30-33.

166 Cf. Tanḥuma list; the list attested in the Paris MS of the Okhlah.

167 Cf. above, pp.37-38. Cf. also the logion of R. Judah as reported in the Mekhilta of R. Simeon ben Yoḥai, cf. above, n.4.

tiqqunim has shown how complex and varied the traditions are. This is particularly true of the Masoretic traditions. The number "eighteen" may appear to be reasonably stable,¹⁶⁸ but the actual passages selected to make up the number vary from list to list. Likewise, the headings for the various lists are not always identical regarding the origin of the tradition. Some say Ezra, some say Ezra and Nehemiah, others are content merely to mention the scribes in general, or the scribes and wise men, or the scribes, the men of the great synagogue.¹⁶⁹

6^o The ambiguity regarding the interpretation of this phenomenon already attested in the Tanḥuma reappears in some of the Masoretic lists, notably in the appendix to the Baer-Strack edition of the Diqduqe,¹⁷⁰ which speaks of a list of kinnuyim which were not emended by the scribes!

7^o The silence or discretion of some of the better quality Hebrew MSS regarding the phenomenon raises some final questions. How genuine and authentic a tradition is preserved in these lists of kinnuyim and tiqqunim? Has it any bearing on the science of textual criticism, or should one conclude with W.E. Barnes¹⁷¹ that

"The tikkun tradition belongs rather to Midrash than to Masorah, i.e., its true bearing is on exegesis, not on textual criticism; the tikkune sopherim are interpretations, not readings. ?

168 Of particular interest, then, are the two MSS which give "thirteen" as the heading for their lists. See above, pp.49-50.

169 Cf. the Tanḥuma tradition and the Yalquṭ ha-Makhiri lists.

170 Cf. above, pp.44-45.

171 Cf. op. cit.,

C H A P T E R 3

AN EXAMINATION OF THE TIQQUNE SOPHERIM WITH A VIEW
TO ESTABLISHING THE AUTHENTICITY OF EACH SO-CALLED
EMENDATION

(a) Zechariah 2:12

כי כה אמר יהוה צבאות אחר כבוד שלחני אל הגוים השללים אתכם
כי הנגע בכם נגע בבנה עינו

It is logical to begin this investigation of each of the official tiqqune sopherim with Zech 2:12, for in the earliest sources it is this verse which serves as a reminder of the existence of other similar cases.¹ Both Judah ben Ilay² and Joshua ben Levi³ are reported as citing this verse in support of their statements regarding kinnuyim and tiqqunim respectively, and, as will be shown in the following paragraphs, it features in all the sources consulted for this study, with the exception of three⁴ of the four lists in R. Martin's *Pugio Fidei*.

The immediate context in which Zech 2:12 appears is an address to the exiles on the part of Yahweh, through the intermediary of his prophet, telling them how he is going to treat the nations who have despoiled them - for he who touches Israel is touching the apple of his eye.⁵ This last phrase, Joshua ben Levi maintains, originally read "my eye", but was

-
- 1 See above, pp.25ff., especially pp.25-30, where it features as no.1 in all the early lists and reproductions of these sources in later traditions. It is only when the lists are systematised into biblical order that Zech 2:12 loses its no.1 position.
 - 2 See above, pp.25-26, nn.4-5. The logion of R. Judah (c. 130-160 A.D.) is reproduced in both Siphre and Mekhilta.
 - 3 See above, p.38. Although the source reporting R. Joshua's logion is relatively later (Exodus Rabbah), Joshua taught at the beginning of the third century (c. 210-240).
 - 4 The lists on foll. 222, 243 and 548. In general, Martin's version of the tradition seems to be more concerned with polemical aims than with a faithful transmission of the lists as such. See above, pp.52-54.
 - 5 Cf. RSV's translation: "For he who touches you touches the apple of his eye".

emended by the scribes to the present MT: "his eye".⁶

Following Joshua's logion, but differing in smaller details, the Tanḥuma and Yalquṭ ha-Makhiri both present Zech 2:12 as a scribal emendation and supply the "original" reading. The latter source reproduces Joshua's logion, in a slightly different form from that of Exodus Rabbah, which it claims to be citing.⁷ "My eye" is also cited by al-Qirqisani as the so-called original reading for this text. The same is true for those of the Masoretic lists which supply original readings.⁸ The Aruch of Nathan ben Yehiel,⁹ citing the Tanḥuma tradition, though in a slightly different form,¹⁰ states that in the "First Books"¹¹ it was written "the apple of my eye". The notes in the Minhṭat Shai Bible¹² for Zech 2:12 also attest this reading. Thus, the majority of later rabbinic sources faithfully carry on this tradition concerning the original form of Zech 2:12.¹³

Of the earlier kinnuyim traditions attested in the Siphre and Mekhilta, it can be argued that the sense of the euphemism that Judah ben Ilay speaks of must have been that the sacred text was rendered with the third person singular suffix, although it would really have had a first person suffix if a "euphemism" had not been employed.¹⁴ The context in which

6 Cf. Exodus Rabbah XIII,1.

7 Cf. Greenup ed., *op. cit.*, p.31: "Rabbi Judah ben Levi said, This is a tiqqun sopherim; it was written with yodh."

8 Cf. List no.206 in Ginsburg's *Massorah*, (cf. p.42 above); the list in the Paris MS of the Okhlah (cf. p.43 above); the list appended to MS 1425 of Ma'ase Ephod (cf. p.48 above).

9 Ed. A. Kohut, *Aruch Completum*. New York 1955, Vol. 4, col. 181a; cf. Geiger, *op. cit.*, p.310n.

10 The tradition of the tiqqune sopherim seems to have been treated at Deut 2:31 in the Tanḥuma traditions available to the compiler of the Aruch.

11 בספרים הראשונים.

12 Compiled in 1742-44 by Shelomo Norzi. It is worth noting at this point that MS 300 in Kennicott's *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum Variis Lectionibus*, Oxford 1776-80, is a printed copy of these notes, and that MS 683ⁿ refers to an edited list of tiqqune sopherim based on the traditional Masoretic lists.

13 Neither Rashi nor Ibn Ezra comment on Zech 2:12 as a scribal emendation.

14 The form of the logion of R. Judah as reported in the Mekhilta of R. Simeon ben Yohai bears out this point clearly, and indeed, it could almost be included among the rabbinic witnesses for an original "my eye". The logion reads as follows: "Rabbi Judah said, There is no teaching to be derived from waw but rather from yodh, for everyone who does damage to any man of Israel, it is as if he does damage to the One

Zech 2:12 is used in the Siphre and Mekhilta makes it obvious that "his eye" refers to the divine eye,¹⁵ and "the euphemism that Scripture has used" was precisely to speak of the divine eye in the third person rather than in the first.¹⁶ The fact that Radaq, who was well aware of the tiqqunim traditions, was later able to interpret the third person suffix as referring to one's own eye and not to the divine eye,¹⁷ shows the possible ambiguity that now lies in the "corrected" MT, but it does not seem that the essential "emendation" in this case necessarily consisted in changing the suffix from referring directly to God in the first person to a third person anonymous (i.e. reflexive) suffix,¹⁸ but rather in the change from a first to a third person suffix which still referred to God, but in the third person.¹⁹

If it can be shown that the kinnuyim tradition is indeed referring to the same phenomenon as the tiqqune sopherim, but in a more guarded

who spoke and the world came into being." See above, p.25, n.4.

- 15 The logion here is as follows: "Rabbi Judah said, It does not say here: 'The apple of the eye' but 'The apple of his eye', referring as it were to the One above. Scripture, however, has used a euphemism." The Constantinople edition (1515) of the Mekhilta reads a different form again: "Rabbi Judah said, 'The apple of my eye' is written, referring to the One above, but Scripture has used a euphemism." This form also appears to confirm the original reading of tiqqunim traditions.
- 16 See above, pp.27ff., for an analysis of the structure of the passage in the Siphre which clearly presupposes that the eye in question is the divine eye. Whether the correction took place before, after or because of the formation of this tradition recorded in the Siphre does not basically affect the sense in which Zech 2:12 is used in this tradition. Judah's logion and subsequent list could be removed from the passage without harming the basic structure of the five Phrases, each of which contains the parallel idea that what concerns Israel also concerns God.
- 17 Cf. Radaq, commentary in loco: "He who touches you will not go acquitted, like the man who touches the pupil of his eye ... so anyone who touches you will hurt his own self."
- 18 Consequently, the author does not fully agree with W. McKane, op. cit., p.70, when he says: "Those who postulate a tikkun and who suppose that the original was 'eni' are bound to assume that the scribes who made the correction intended 'his own eye', since the scandal would not be removed by substituting 'Yahweh's eye' for 'my eye'."
- 19 The practice of using the third person where the first is really intended is attested in the Talmud in Hagiga 15a; Sanhedrin 95b; Mo'ed Qaṭan 28b. See also Shebu'oth 36a, and see below, pp.173ff. The expression "The apple of his eye" occurs in Deut 32:10, where it is God's eye (with another word, 'ishon', for pupil).

"euphemistic" way, then the logion of R. Judah ben Ilay can be taken as an indirect confirmation of the original reading, "my eye".²⁰

A study of the context in which Zech 2:12 occurs shows that it is necessary to try to determine where Yahweh's speech begins, and where the prophet is speaking on Yahweh's behalf.²¹ If Yahweh speaks directly only at the beginning of v.13: "Behold, I will shake my hand over them ...", the latter part of v.12 would be the prophet's words;²² the eye would remain the divine eye, or one's own eye,²³ and there would be no need to read anything other than a third person singular suffix. But if it can be shown that Yahweh speaks directly already in v.12, this would provide a strong contextual argument for the reading "my eye", already noted in the rabbinic traditions as being the "original" reading, and which, as will be seen, has some textual support.

A number of more recent commentators interpret v.12b as direct speech and also accept the reading, "my eye".²⁴ In particular the analysis of A. Petitjean, in his study of the oracles of Proto-Zechariah,²⁵ deserves attention. He characterises Zech 2:10-13 as a separate oracle, consisting in its

20 Indeed, its forms in the Mekhilta of R. Simeon ben Yoḥai and in the Constantinople edition of the Mekhilta of R. Ishmael are very significant. See below, pp.68-69.

21 Much of the difficulty in this verse comes from the words, "After the glory sent me", which follow immediately after "Thus says Yahweh" in v.12a. Many commentators suggest their deletion, or consider them to be a gloss.

22 Cf. W. Nowack, Kleine Propheten. (HK), Göttingen 1903, p.34; A. van Hoonacker, Les Douze Petits Prophètes. Paris 1908, pp.602-603; H. Mitchell, Minor Prophets II. (ICC), Edinburgh 1912, pp.142-43. Cf. RSV: v.12 For thus says the LORD of hosts:

- after his glory sent me to the nations who plundered you,
for he who touches you touches the apple of his eye, -

v.13 Behold I will shake my hand over them ...

23 See above, nn.17-18.

24 Cf. H. Junker, Die Zwölf kleinen Propheten II. (HSAT), Bonn 1938, p.128; K. Elliger, Die Zwölf kleinen Propheten II. (ATD), Göttingen 1950, pp. 109-110; T.H. Robinson and F. Horst, Die Zwölf kleinen Propheten. (HAT), Tübingen 1954, pp.224-25; W. Rudolph, Haggai, Sacharja, Maleachi. (KAT), Gütersloh 1976, pp.86-88. Cf. J (1973):

Car ainsi parle Yahvé Sabaoth
après que la Gloire m'eût envoyé
à propos des nations qui vous dépouillèrent
"Qui vous touche, touche à la prunelle de mon oeil".

25 A. Petitjean, Les Oracles du Proto-Zacharie. (EB), Paris-Louvain 1969, pp.89-127.

first part of two propositions in the imperative (vv.10-12, "flee!" and "escape!"), followed by the proclamation of a divine intervention in favour of Israel in its second part (v.13, "Behold, I will ...").²⁶ He interprets the difficult phrase, "After the glory sent me", as the prophet's brief reference to his mission to the chosen people in the midst of the foreign nations,²⁷ while v.12b represents the message which Yahweh addressed to the prophet in his sending him to the nations.²⁸

Petitjean shows that in thus interpreting v.12b as a direct message from Yahweh, the reading "my eye" fits perfectly into the sequence, which is continued in v.13a: "Behold I will shake my hand over them".²⁹ The acceptance of this phrase as coming directly from the mouth of Yahweh restores colour to this address and inspires greater cause for confidence among the dispirited exiles.

An analysis of the textual evidence for this verse gives the following picture. The MT reads "his eye", a reading also attested by the Targum and Syriac. The main stream of the LXX and of what is available of the Old Latin³⁰ likewise attest "his eye". However, there are traces of the reading "my eye" in both. The Codex Washingtonensis attests this reading.³¹ Tertullian in his Adversus Marcionem³² cites Zech 2:12b as follows: "qui tetigerit vos, ac si pupillam oculi mei tangat." One could argue that Justin presupposes a similar reading when he refers to those touching "the pupil of God." Barthélemy³⁴ has shown, from a study of the

26 Op. cit., pp.95-6. He compares the structure of this oracle with that of Is 45:1-5.

27 Ibid., p.119. See above, n.21.

28 By thus respecting the various elements in v.12, Petitjean shows that the prophet's allusion to his mission is an indication that this oracle (vv.10-13) is one of the oldest in the book, and not composed in 519 B.C., at the same time as the visions.

29 Op. cit., p.120.

30 Cf. P. Sabatier, Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae seu Vetus Italica. Vol. 2, Remis 1743, p.987.

31 Cf. J. Ziegler, Septuaginta, Vol. XIII, Duodecim Prophetarum. Göttingen 1943, p.295. The reading τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ is attested by 534 (Catenen Gruppe).

32 Cf. ed. C. Moreschini, Tertulliani Adversus Marcionem. Milan 1971 (IV, 35, 1), p.294.

33 Cf. Dialogus cum Tryphone. CXXXVII,2. (cf. ed. J. Otto, Jena 1843, II, p.450): ὁ ἀπρόμενος κόρης τοῦ θεοῦ. Barthélemy suggests that since Tertullian relied considerably on Justin's Dialogue in composing his

fragments of the Minor Prophets found in 1952 in a Judean cave, the Quinta,³⁵ certain citations of Justin, the first two hands of the Codex Washingtonensis and the Coptic versions of Upper Egypt, the existence of a recension of the Greek Minor Prophets made in Palestine under the authority of the rabbis in the first half of the first century A.D. Consequently, he suggests that this recension might possibly have "corrected" the "his eye" of the LXX of Zech 2:12 to "my eye".³⁶

A further trace of the reading "my eye" is preserved in the textual tradition for a citation of Zech 2:12 by St. Augustine,³⁷ who interprets this verse as referring to the divine mission of the Son by the Father. The textual evidence for this citation of Zech 2:12 reflects the MT, but with one notable exception,³⁸ which reads: "quia qui tetigerit vos, quasi tangat pupillam oculi mei."

The textual tradition of the Vulgate is divided on this reading. Of the nine sources listed by Weber³⁹ for this verse, five MSS⁴⁰ follow the MT, while three MSS and the Clementine edition attest "oculi mei". St. Jerome in his commentary on Zechariah⁴¹ attests the MT in the lemmata of both LXX and Vulgate, as well as in his actual commentary.

Adversus Marcionem, it is possible that the citation of Zech 2:12 by Tertullian mentioned above was taken from that part of Justin's Dialogue which is not extant. Cf. "Les Tiquuné Sopherim", p.95,n.2.

- 34 D. Barthélemy, Les Devanciers d'Aquila. Leiden 1963, pp.196-245.
- 35 The Quinta of the Minor Prophets, as cited by Origen and Jerome. Cf. Barthélemy, op. cit., pp.211-27.
- 36 Cf. op. cit., p.211; also "Les Tiquuné Sopherim", pp.95-6.
- 37 Cf. ed. E. Hoffmann, De Civitate Dei. Vol. 2, Prague 1900, reprinted in New York and London 1962 (CSEL), Book XX, Ch. 30, pp.506-507.
- 38 The MS p (= Cod. bibl. universitatis Patavinae, no.1469, scl. XIV, omnes libros continens). Cf. p.XIV, Vol. 1 of Hoffmann's edition, where he remarks that this MS sometimes is alone in recording "genuine readings".
- 39 Cf. ed. R. Weber, Biblia Sacra, juxta vulgatam versionem. Vol. 2, Stuttgart 1969, p.1418. The MSS O, S, φ and the Clementine edition (1592) have oculi mei. The first two MSS are dated 8-9th centuries and φ represents the recension of Alcuin.
- 40 Only one (6th century) of these five MSS is older than the rest which are dated 8th to 10th centuries.
- 41 Cf. ed. D. Vallarsius, Hieronymi Operum. 12 Volumes, Venice 1786, Vol. 4, pp.795-97.

Finally, to this complex textual evidence, two more recently discovered important elements must be added. From among the Qumran MSS, it can be stated with reasonable certitude that a fragment from 4QXII^e reads עֵינִי, "my eye", and another fragment containing Zech 2:12 included among the Geniza Bible Fragments⁴² attests a similar reading.

How should this textual evidence be evaluated? First of all, it is evident that the MT reading, "his eye", is attested by the greater number of MSS for each of the textual traditions of the Versions as well as the Hebrew text, in such a way that if it be an "emendation", it was a very thoroughly and successfully imposed one.⁴³ Nevertheless, evidence for the reading "my eye", even if somewhat scarce, is still present in the Hebrew, Greek, Old Latin and Vulgate textual traditions. The Hebrew fragments are the most significant in attesting the one-time existence of the reading "my eye". The Qumran fragment shows that this textual alternative to the MT was in existence before 90 A.D. The Geniza fragment attests that this same reading continued to survive in a Babylonian text type.

The LXX variants may either represent evidence of recensional activity aimed at bringing the LXX into line with that form of the Hebrew text which the school of Hillel considered normative before the destruction of the Second Temple,⁴⁴ or else, they may represent the only surviving direct evidence of the Old Greek, in which case the main-stream of the LXX could represent the text after Origen's recension.

The variants in Tertullian and Augustine indicate that at least part of the textual tradition of the Old Latin contained "oculi mei". The Vulgate textual tradition also shows that this reading managed to survive in quite a sizeable portion of the sources available, in spite of Jerome's endeavours to have the Vulgate based on the standard Hebrew text.

Thus, this textual evidence for the reading "my eye", while not extensive, is nonetheless sufficiently coherent as to permit the following

42 Cf. I. Yeivin, *Geniza Bible Fragments*. Jerusalem 1973, Vol. 4, p.418: Eb. 88: Holon, Ginzey Teiman (Text and Targum, full pointing. Babylonian. Masora magna et masora parva).

43 It is possible that the ultimate origin of a variant reading for Zech 2:12 may have been due to a chance corruption, or to a purely material error on the part of a copyist, and that the midrashic traditions surrounding this case represent a subsequent attempt to explain the reading "his eye" as the emended form of an original "my eye".

44 Cf. Barthélemy, "Les Tiquuné Sopherim", p.96. See above, p.65f.

conclusion: there exists a genuine textual alternative to the MT of Zech 2:12, which, when taken in conjunction with an analysis of the literary and stylistic features of the oracle within which it occurs, appears to justify the strong rabbinic traditions concerning this verse. The fact that, of all the passages listed in both tiqqunim and kinnuyim sources, this verse is the most commented upon, and would seem to serve as an introduction to, or as a reminder of this phenomenon, must surely be of significance. The fact also that the emended reading, which results from a very slight exchange of one consonant for another, is presented as having been corrected for theological motives, should not be overlooked. And, finally, the fact that there really were genuine emendations among the tiqqune sopherim⁴⁵ in turn helps to establish the authenticity of Zech 2:12 as a scribal correction.

It is appropriate at this point to try to penetrate a little further the relationship between the terms kinnuyim and tiqqunim. The question has already been raised⁴⁶ as to what significance should be attached to the fluctuation in the use of these terms in the transmission of the traditions concerning Zech 2:12 and accompanying lists. Are the two expressions referring to the same phenomenon in a complementary fashion or do they represent mutually exclusive approaches to the interpretation of these verses?

One way of trying to answer this question might be expressed as follows: if, between the time of the official promulgation of the newly canonised text at the end of the first century A.D., and the time of Joshua ben Levi in the first half of the third century, it were absolutely unthinkable to voice aloud a tradition of scribal emendations in the face of the freshly standardised text, could not the "euphemisms" of Judah ben Ilay be regarded as referring in general to this same phenomenon? Could not Judah be speaking "euphemistically" in saying that "Scripture has used a euphemism"?⁴⁷

In other words, due to historical circumstances, it might have been necessary that, for a period, traditions concerning the phenomenon of

45 See below, à propos of Job 7:20 and 1 Sam 3:13, pp.76-81, and see also Ch. 6 concerning other theological corrections to which the biblical text was subjected in these early centuries.

46 See above, pp.58-59.

47 See below, Ch. 5, on the use of euphemism and other oblique and substitute expressions in the Talmud, Midrashim and Bible.

scribal emendations could only be handed down under cover of a theory of euphemistic expressions, which had been written thus from the beginning. These, in turn, may have given rise to the haggadic traditions contained in the Siphre and Mekhilta, while the tiggunim tradition too, in the person of Joshua ben Levi and his disciple, Simeon ben Pazzi, would have given impetus to the later amplified traditions in the Tanḥuma, etc., and the other lists mentioned above. Traditions were at no stage precise, but a chance reference here and there, together with the memory that certain texts had been emended for theological motives, would be later developed, amplified and quite often mistaken.

Yet another way of formulating an attempt to answer this difficult question might be expressed as follows: in spite of the different terms, it is basically the same tradition. The difference in terminology could be accounted for as two complementary ways of viewing the same phenomenon; possibly two schools of interpretation, one with the accent on the fact that these biblical passages were expressed "euphemistically" by their original authors (thereby illustrating their preoccupation to avoid any semblance that the text was interfered with, or their ignorance of the fact that it had actually been emended), whereas the other terminology admits that the text was changed, but, by means of a neat "list", avoids giving the impression that the sacred text was changed at will by the scribes.

In any event, the following points may be put forward with some measure of confidence:

(a) The term tigqune sopherim refers to the recollection or memory of a corrective initiative, undertaken for theological motives, which may be placed in the last two centuries B.C. and the early Christian years.⁴⁸

(b) The kinnuyim interpretation refers to this same phenomenon, but in more general terms. Kinnuy describes some form of substitution, whether oral or written.

(c) Although the term tigqune sopherim is attested in sources which are more recent than those using the kinnuyim terms, nevertheless, the activity it describes is older than the earliest midrashic sources for either term.

⁴⁸ It is not possible to determine exactly when the term itself was first used, but the phenomenon it describes certainly has its roots in the last pre-Christian centuries onwards. See below, Ch.6, for further details on scribal emendatory initiative apart from that attested in the lists.

Finally, if it can be maintained that the term tigqune sopherim does indeed refer to an historical fact, it would be naïve to maintain that each of the eighteen emendations is equally genuine, or that these are the only genuine scribal emendations in the Bible.

Having shown that there exists some foundation for the trustworthiness of R. Joshua's logion concerning Zech 2:12 as a scribal emendation, the traditions centering on the logion of Joshua's disciple, Simeon ben Pazzi, must now be examined, to see if they too may be included in the above conclusions.

(b) Genesis 18:22

ויפנו משם האנשים וילכו סדמה ואברהם עודנו עמד לפני יהוה

Chapter 18 of Genesis tells of Abraham entertaining three mysterious visitors (vv. 1-8) and the promise of a son (vv. 9-15). The "men" turn to go to Sodom, and are accompanied by Abraham (v.16). Meanwhile the LORD's purpose to destroy Sodom is related (vv.17-21), followed by Abraham's plea on behalf of the city (vv.22-23). As the text of Ch.18 stands, there is a certain amount of confusion as to the exact identity and role of these mysterious visitors. Verse 16 tells how the "men" rose to go to Sodom, accompanied by Abraham. Leaving aside discussion about the precise relationship between the LORD and the "men", one finds v.22 relating that the "men" went to Sodom, and that "Abraham was still standing before the LORD".

Certain rabbinic traditions, followed by Masoretic lists, record this present form of the verse as a scribal emendation for an originally more logical but irreverent introduction to Abraham's plea. Since Abraham accompanied the "men" in the direction of Sodom (v.16), he could not be said to be "still standing before the LORD", rather the omnipresent LORD was still standing before Abraham. But this would be a disrespectful expression, placing the LORD in an inferior position to Abraham;⁴⁹ hence the need for a scribal intervention, reversing the order of the words to preserve due respect for divine transcendence.

Before examining the sources which record this verse as a scribal emendation, it is interesting to note that it is entirely absent from the

⁴⁹ The expression עמד לפני, "to stand before" denotes the attitude of man before the LORD, and that of the servant before his master; cf. Deut 4:10; 29:14; Jer 35:19; 52:12; 2 Chron 9:7.

early traditions, and only makes its entry into the lists from the Tanhuma traditions onwards.⁵⁰ However, it is identified as a tiqqun and commented on as such by Simeon ben Pazzi,⁵¹ disciple of Joshua ben Levi. This comment of Simeon is repeated and further interpreted a number of times in later midrashic writings.

The logion in question, which is anterior to the earliest lists which feature Gen 18:22 as a scribal correction, appears in its simplest form in Genesis Rabbah XLIX,7,⁵² in connection with Gen 18:22:

"And they went towards Sodom; but Abraham stood yet before the LORD." R. Simeon said: 'This is a tiqqun of the scribes, for the Shekinah was actually waiting for Abraham.'

Another logion of R. Simeon may be found in a relatively simple form in the Palestinian Talmud,⁵³ where, in discussing respect for old age as part of the exegesis of Ex 33:9, he interprets Lev 19:32 as follows:

Thou shalt rise up before old age and shalt honour the presence of an old man and thou shalt revere thy God, I am the LORD. I am he who first (rose up) to observe (the law of) standing before an old man.

Though not explicitly stated in the Talmud, R. Simeon is probably here referring or alluding to the haggadic interpretation of Gen 18:1 as found in Genesis Rabbah XLVIII, 1⁵⁴ and 7,⁵⁵ where the LORD stood while Abraham sat. He may also be alluding to Gen 18:22 and his logion referring to the "original" form of the verse,⁵⁶ which would thus be likewise an illustration

50 See above, p.55, for details concerning the various lists.

51 See above, p.37.

52 Ibid., n.53.

53 Bikkurim 65c. Cf. W. Bacher, Die Agada der Pal. Amoräer, Vol.2, p.457, n.4. See also, PTal, Rosh Hashana 57b, which cites this logion in another context.

54 Genesis Rabbah XLVIII, 1 interprets Ps 18:36 in function of Abraham: "'And thy condescension has made me great'; with what great condescension did the LORD make Abraham great? In that he sat while the Shekinah stood; thus is it written: 'And the LORD appeared to him... as he sat'."

55 Genesis Rabbah XLVIII,7: "'As he sat (יָשָׁב) in the tent door in the heat of the day'. R. Berekiah said in R. Levi's name: This is written yashab, "he sat"; he wished to rise, but God said to him: sit and thou art a token to thy children; as thou sittest and the Shekinah will stand, as it says, 'God stands in the congregation of God' (Ps 82:1)."

56 See above, p.37,n.53.

of the LORD being first to carry out his laws.⁵⁷

These two logia (Genesis Rabbah XLIX, 7 and Bikkurim 65c) are reproduced in later midrashic writings to illustrate the exegesis of various texts. The second one is found in Leviticus Rabbah XXXV, 3 on Lev 26:3, where it is reproduced anonymously.⁵⁸ The first one reappears oftener, and in writings that were taking place simultaneously, so that it is difficult to determine exact relationships and dependency. Reference has already been made above⁵⁹ to the fact that this logion is found in Leviticus Rabbah XI,5 in the exposition of Ps 18:26 as one of the occasions on which the Holy One acted with special courtesy towards Abraham; reference has also been made to three other writings⁶⁰ which contain a similar interpretation of Ps 18:36 and which appear to be drawing on the Leviticus Rabbah tradition: Tanḥuma (Buber ed.) at Bereshith 4; Exodus Rabbah XLI,4 and Midrash Tehillim at Ps 18, par. 22 and 29.

The aim of this rapid survey is to show the dependency of the later midrashic writings on these two logia of R. Simeon and on the traditions in Genesis Rabbah XLVIII,1 and 7, so that the value of these later references will be proportional to the trustworthiness or otherwise, of Simeon's statement that Gen 18:22 is to be interpreted as a scribal emendation and that its original form was that the LORD was still standing before Abraham.

Gen 18:22 is recorded as a scribal emendation in the Tanḥuma, Yalquṭ ha-Makhiri and al-Qirqisani sources;⁶¹ it is present in all the Masoretic lists which feature on the chart, p.55 above, with the exception of the list, BM Add. 21, 161; it is recorded in three of the four lists in Pugio Fidei.⁶² Rashi comments on it as being a tiqqun sopherim, apparently drawing on the Genesis Rabbah traditions mentioned in the preceding pages, but neither Radaq nor Ibn Ezra refer to it in this context. In the lists

57 Later midrashic works certainly connect these interpretations of the two verses, Gen 18:1 and 22, seeing both as examples of God's condescension (Ps 18:36). Cf. following paragraphs referring to passages in Midrash Tehillim and Exodus Rabbah. See also S. Lieberman, op. cit., p.28, n.5.

58 The citation is probably from PTal, Rosh Hashana, for it includes the preceding logion of R. Eleazar as found in Rosh Hashana 57b.

59 See above, p.37, n.54.

60 See above, p.37, nn.55-58.

61 See above, charts I and II, pp.55-56.

62 The remaining fourth list represents the Siphre tradition, so naturally Gen 18:22 is not listed.

which are accompanied by the "original reading", there is agreement that the original form of Gen 18:22 was that "the LORD was still standing before Abraham". In brief, with regard to rabbinic sources, with the exception of the early kinnuyim lists of the Siphre, Mekhilta, etc., there is almost unanimous agreement, accepted and prolonged by Masoretic circles, that Gen 18:22 is a tiqqun sopherim.

A different impression emerges from a glance at the textual witnesses. All of them, Septuagint, Targums, Old Latin and Vulgate, Samaritan Pentateuch, Syriac and Arabic, together with Qumran,⁶³ agree with the MT, for which neither Kennicott⁶⁴ nor de Rossi⁶⁵ record any variant readings. The Targums merely elaborate that Abraham was praying for Lot as he stood before the LORD. Such strong textual unanimity cannot be lightly disregarded in favour of the numerous rabbinic traditions, even if some of these latter are quite early.

At this point, some help from the field of literary criticism and from modern commentators will help to prepare the way for arguing in favour of the authenticity of the MT textual tradition as opposed to the tiqqun tradition for this case. Wellhausen's theory⁶⁶ that Gen 18:33b originally followed 18:22a and that the intervening verses, while still forming part of the Yahwist traditions, belong to later layers of redaction, has been accepted and developed by later commentators.⁶⁷ Verses 17-19 and 22b-33a would be editorial insertions reflecting theological ideas of a more advanced stage of thought, while the original connection between 18:15 and

63 8Q^{Gn}, cf. Baillet, Milik, de Vaux, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert III. Les Petites Grottes de Qumran. Oxford 1962, p.148.

64 See above, p.62, n.12.

65 J. de Rossi, Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti. Parma 1784-88.

66 Cf. J. Wellhausen, Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des AT. Berlin 1899 (3rd ed.), pp.25ff: "Ich denke wenigstens, dass ursprünglich 18:22a und 18:33b aneinander schlossen, in folgender Weise: 'und die Männer wendeten sich von dannen und gingen nach Sodom, und Abraham kehrte zurück an seinen Ort.' Was zwischen diesen beiden Sätzen steht, zeigt am Anfang und am Ende die Fuge. Nach 22a gehen die Männer fort nach Sodom, die Männer, die nach v.2,3 Jahweh selbst sind, unter denen er mindestens inbegriffen ist. Nach v.22b, 23ff. aber ist Jahweh doch nicht fortgegangen."

67 Cf. H. Gunkel, Genesis. Göttingen 1901 (re-edited in 1966), pp.193ff.; J. Skinner, Genesis. (ICC), Edinburgh 1912, pp.304-5; G. von Rad, Das erste Buch Moses. (ATD), Göttingen 1952, pp. 178ff.; C. Westermann, Genesis, Vol.2, (BK), Neukirchen 1979, pp.346ff.

and 19:1 would have consisted of vv.16,20-22a and 33b.⁶⁸ If one accepts this source theory analysis of Gen 18, there is no need to demand precise logical consistency between vv.16,22a and 22b, and consequently to rearrange the phrase.⁶⁹ Indeed, far more blatant incongruities have been allowed to stand side by side untouched throughout the Pentateuch. The editor or redactor responsible for this insertion would not have been likely to have written that the LORD was still standing before Abraham, firstly, judging by the tenor of the insertion where Abraham is very conscious of being but dust and ashes (v.27),⁷⁰ and secondly, as an insertion, it would not have formed part of the internal movement of the narrative in its simplest form and would, therefore, be liable to be the cause of some discontinuity. Accepting this reasoning, it is consequently not surprising to find the complete textual tradition in agreement as to the original word order of this verse.

An attempt must now be made to try to find out why the bulk of rabbinic tradition, stemming from the time of Simeon ben Pazzi onwards, thought otherwise. The following line of reasoning seeks to show that if one could assume that Simeon himself actually connected his logion on Gen

68 J. Skinner, *op. cit.*, p.304f., enumerates three arguments in favour of this theory, the first being: "In 22a the men (i.e. all three) have moved away to Sodom; in 22b Yahweh remains behind with Abraham. That Yahweh was one of the three is certainly the view of the later editors (cf. 19:1); but if that had been the original conception, it must have been clearly expressed at this point."

69 Nevertheless, both Gunkel and von Rad accept the authenticity of the scribal correction, and incorporate the changed text into their commentaries. So too, Skinner lists among the early commentators who accept this *tiqqun*: E. Kautzsch - A. Socin, *Die Genesis mit Hüsserer Unterscheidung der Quellenschriften*. 1888; C. Ball, *Genesis*. 1896. Other commentators who accept the *tiqqun* include H. Holzinger, *Genesis*. (KHC), Freiburg im B. 1898, p.154; E. Speiser, *Genesis*. (AB), New York 1964, p.132f. Skinner himself does not accept the *tiqqun*, p.304. Other commentators who do not accept it also include A. Dillmann, *Die Blücher Genesis, Exodus und Leviticus*. (KeH), Leipzig 1886 (3rd ed.), p.264; F. Delitzsch, *Neuer Commentar über die Genesis*. Leipzig 1887, p.301; E. Künig, *Die Genesis*. Gütersloh 1925 (2nd ed.), pp.520-21; P. Heinisch, *Das Buch Genesis*. (HSAT), Bonn 1930, p.244 and C. Westermann, *op. cit.*, p.345.

70 Cf. J. Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p.26: "Ich wage auch darauf hinzuweisen, dass der sonst überall in Kap. 18:19 herrschende sehr naive Verkehr der Erztväter mit Gott in 18:22-33 plötzlich aufhört; während Abraham 18:8 dem Jahweh ein Kalb schlachtet und ihm Käse und Milch versetzt, fühlt er 18:23ff. mit einem Mal den Abstand der Kreatur vor dem Schöpfer."

18:22 as recorded in Genesis Rabbah XLIX,7 to the haggadic traditions concerning Gen 18:1 as witnessed to in Genesis Rabbah XLVIII,1 and 7, and alluded to in his logion as recorded in the Palestinian Talmud - a connection which is probable, though not explicit⁷¹ - then one might have a clue to at least part of the origins of the tradition concerning Gen 18:22 as a scribal emendation. In other words, the suggestion being made is that it was in the light of the haggadic interpretations of Gen 18:1, where the LORD showed his condescension by standing while Abraham sat, coupled with the obvious difficulty encountered by the actual form of v.22, that the inspiration for the interpretation of Gen 18:22 in a similar manner, and ultimately as a scribal emendation, was born. If it is remembered that Simeon was a disciple of Joshua ben Levi, to whom the first extant reference in rabbinic literature to tiqqune sopherim may be traced, and who may thus be considered one of the first to use this term for the phenomenon,⁷² one could imagine that Simeon, in an attempt to develop his master's ideas, was not incapable of creating a scribal correction which would thereby provide another parallel to illustrate his own logion concerning the interpretation of the law of "Standing before an Old Man".⁷³

Because the tradition concerning the tiqqune sopherim was in the process of development, it would have been easy to slip in a "new" one. And if it is true, as will be shown in the course of this chapter, that not all of the Eighteen Corrections are genuine, there is no reason why some of the unauthentic ones might not reach back as far as the time of Simeon ben Pazzi and even further. If one also takes into account the popularity of the al-tiqre method⁷⁴ of interpretation of the sacred text, which was very much used at this period,⁷⁵ one might have another factor which helped Gen 18:22 along the road towards tiqqun status.⁷⁶

It follows that if Simeon's logion concerning Gen 18:22, in as much as it considers the verse to be a scribal correction, may not be accepted as recording a historical fact, the later midrashic traditions containing reference to this verse as a tiqqun may likewise be considered untrustworthy.

71 See above, n.10.

72 See above, pp.68-69.

73 PTal, Bikkurim 65c. See above, n.3.

74 See below, pp.139-166.

75 See below, pp.160-161.

76 See below, p.144, n.48 and pp.161-162.

The absence of Gen 18:22 from the lists in the Siphre-Mekhilta traditions could very probably be seen as confirmation that Gen 18:22 as a "scribal emendation" is an innovation.

A. Geiger argues in favour of the authenticity of Gen 18:22 as a tiqqun by drawing attention to the fact that in Ex 17:6, "before you" is translated by the LXX with an adverb of time rather than of place, and that the ambiguous "He stood before him there" of Ex 34:5 is interpreted in favour of Moses rather than the LORD in the Jerusalem Targum.⁷⁷ However, both points may be used to the opposite effect: if it is true that the LXX in Ex 17:6 "corrects" what might be harmful to the LORD's dignity, why is not the analogous "correction" for Gen 18:22 recorded in the LXX? Secondly, if the Jerusalem Targum interprets an ambiguous verse in Ex 34:5 in favour of having Moses stand before the LORD rather than vice versa, does not this confirm a parallel tendency of interpreting represented by Simeon's logion on Gen 18:22, both having their roots in rabbinic traditions rather than in the history of textual transmission? If Gen 18:22 be an authentic tiqqun, why then was not Gen 19:27 also drawn into these traditions?⁷⁸

In concluding that the rabbinic and midrashic traditions which regard Gen 18:22 as a tiqqun sopherim may not be trusted, another point emerges which will serve as a useful guide in further investigation in this chapter: the fact that a given tiqqun is well attested in the lists and has an authoritative figure (Simeon ben Pazzi) specifically promoting it, does not necessarily guarantee its authenticity. The unauthenticity of Gen 18:22 opens the way for the possibility of other false tiqqunim being incorporated into even the earliest recorded references in the Siphre and Mekhilta lists.

(c) 1 Samuel 3:13 and Job 7:20

Having established that there are reasonable grounds for regarding Zech 2:12 as an authentic correction and Gen 18:22 as unauthentic, these two being the most widely attested as corrections in rabbinic and midrashic sources apart from the lists, 1 Sam 3:13 and Job 7:20 are now chosen for a common examination because they are the only two among the lists of eighteen

⁷⁷ Cf. op. cit., p.332.

⁷⁸ Gen 19:27, "Abraham went to the place where he had stood before the LORD".

for which the main stream of the Septuagint tradition differs from that of the Hebrew. In as much as the "original" readings proposed by the tiq-qunim traditions for these two verses coincide substantially with the corresponding LXX readings, 1 Sam 3:13 and Job 7:20 stand a good chance of recording genuine corrections.

(i) 1 Sam 3:13

אשר ידע כי מקללים להם בניו ולא כהה בם

1 Sam 3:13 forms part of Yahweh's prophecy to the boy Samuel, where he tells him how he is going to treat Eli because, knowing that his sons were cursing "themselves" ! (MT) he did not rebuke them. That this is a scribal correction, or kinnuv, according to the early traditions, is recorded in the Mekhilta list and its citation in the Yalquṭ Shime'oni at both Ex 15:7 and 1 Sam 3:13, in the Siphre Zuṭṭa and Midrash Haggadol lists, in the Tanḥuma and its citation in the Yalquṭ ha-Makhiri, in al-Qirqisani's work, and in all the Masoretic lists recorded in Ch. 2 above.⁷⁹ It is absent from the Siphre list and from the citation of this list in both Yalquṭ Shime'oni at Num 11:15 and Pugio Fidei, fol.669. It is also absent from the other three lists in Pugio Fidei.⁸⁰ In those lists which supply "original" readings, a certain variety may be observed as regards the original reading for this verse, without, however, any basic change of meaning. In each case, the original idea contained in the verse is that "The sons of Eli were cursing God". The Siphre Zuṭṭa, Midrash Haggadol and the list appended to the Diqduqe record כִּלְפִי מַעֲלָה; the Constantinople edition of the Tanḥuma, together with the MSS Oxford Neubauer 2491 and 156 and de Rossi MS 261 record לִי.⁸¹ This rendering is also recorded in the partial list, T.S.D., 1,61, in the Okhlah list, in Rashi and the Minḥat Shai Bible notes. Al-Qirqisani records a double reading, לִי בְנֵי, not attested elsewhere. The lists in the Yalquṭ ha-Makhiri, MS BM 1425 and Ginsburg no.206 attest לוֹ, and finally Radaq reads לֹא as original.⁸²

79 See above, pp.42-52, and the chart on p.55.

80 See above, pp.52-54.

81 The remaining editions and MSS tradition for the Tanḥuma do not give any original reading for this case. See above, p.35 and p.36,n.47.

82 C.F. Houbigantius, Notae Criticae in universos Veteris Testamenti libros. Frankfurt am Main 1777, p.289 gives לִי הֵם as the original reading (blasphemare me faciunt illi), adding that "hujus antiquae scriptionis testes sunt Judaei" and that the emendation consisted in

Of the textual witnesses, the LXX reads καταλογοῦντες θεόν, presupposing an original אלהים; the Targum, faithful to the MT, has אלה. The Syriac, la'amah, "the people", might be better understood as an interpretation of the MT rather than as a diverging tradition. The Vulgate, by paraphrasing with "indigne agere" does not commit itself directly as to what the original text contained.⁸³

Thus, both rabbinic sources and Septuagint agree that אלה is not the original form of the verse, but differ in what they propose as original. Radaq's form, אלה, may be considered as an indirect confirmation of the LXX reading, while the forms אלה and אלה present the same grammatical difficulty as the MT form, אלה.⁸⁴ Besides the antiquity of the Septuagint tradition in comparison to the relatively recent rabbinic sources which offer an original reading, other arguments in favour of the authenticity of the LXX reading, "God", may be suggested. Grammatically speaking, it presents no problem.⁸⁵ In keeping with methods of scribal corrective activity, which seem to have consisted in as little alteration as possible, the form אלהים evolves very easily into אלה. To explain the forms found in rabbinic traditions as a posteriori attempts to supply the original reading⁸⁶ - the memory of the essential tradition never having been lost - is an additional argument in favour of the LXX reading being the original one.

The adoption of the original wording of the phrase, "Because his sons were cursing God and he rebuked them not", restores the gravity of the offence and the reason for the ensuing severe punishment decreed for the house of Eli,⁸⁷ and at the same time, illustrates the motive which must have

the omission of yodh. This version of the "original" has not been found in any of the Jewish sources consulted for this study.

- 83 In thus paraphrasing, it may be indirectly indicating awareness of the two streams of textual tradition, the MT and LXX.
- 84 The verb קלל, "to curse", in the pi'el form is always used in the Bible with a direct object, whether a suffix or separate object, and is only found once with a preposition, beth, in the sense of blasphemy, cf. Is 8:21. Cf. A. Geiger, op. cit., p.271n.
- 85 Cf. Ex 22:27 and Lev 24:15.
- 86 They were probably influenced by the actual form of the MT in the process of reconstructing the original reading. Otherwise, it is hard to explain the reappearance of lamedh.
- 87 Modern commentators, etc., accept that the original reading here is אלהים, many of them making reference to the tigqune sopherim tradition and/or to Geiger, op. cit., p.271. Cf. O. Thenius, Die Bücher Samuels. (KeH), Leipzig 1842 (1st ed.), p.15; 1864 (2nd ed.) p.17; 1893 (3rd ed.)

prompted the alteration: reverence for the use of the divine name, which would not allow its usage in conjunction with "curse".⁸⁸ An allusion to this emendation may lie in the following tradition recorded in the Talmud:⁸⁹

R. Hiyya b. Abba reported in the name of R. Johanan:
it is better that one letter be uprooted from the Torah
than that the Name of names be publicly profaned.

(ii) Job 7:20

למה שמחנני למפגע לך ואהיה עלי למשא

The same motive may be seen to underlie the similar type of emendation in Job 7:20, though the phrase in its original form is not as strikingly blasphemous. Job is complaining to his Creator about his present situation, asking the Almighty why he has made him a target at which he aims blows, so that Job has become a burden to him. That Job should thus declare that he has become a burden to God was deemed to need correcting, hence the present MT form which states that Job has become a burden "to himself".

Rabbinic sources are almost unanimous in numbering Job 7:20 among the lists; it appears as early as the Siphre⁹⁰ and Mekhilta, and is reproduced in all the other various sources listed above,⁹¹ with the exception of one list in the Yalqut Shime'oni,⁹² the Siphre Zutṭa as reconstructed by

p.24; J. Wellhausen, *Der Text de Bücher Samuelis*. Göttingen 1871, p.53; S.R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*. Oxford 1890, p.35; K. Budde, *The Books of Samuel in Hebrew*. Leipzig 1894, p.55; idem., *Die Bücher Samuel*. (KHC), Tübingen u. Leipzig 1902, p.28; W. Nowack, *Die Bücher Samuelis* (HK), Göttingen 1902, p.19; P. Dhorme, *Les Livres de Samuel*. (EB), Paris 1910, p.44; H.P. Smith, *Samuel*. (ICC), Edinburgh 1912, p.28f.; A. Schulz, *Die Bücher Samuel*. (EH), Münster 1917, Vol.1, p.63f.; K. Leimbach, *Samuel*. (HSAT), Bonn 1936, p.32; H. Hertzberg, *Die Samuelbücher*. (ATD), Göttingen 1956, p.27; H.J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis*. (KAT), Göttersloh 1973, p.122; the HOTTP Committee, Vol.2, Stuttgart 1976, p.156, also gave a very strong rating, A, for the LXX reading for this case.

88 Cf. Ch.s 5 and 6 below, for other ways in which expressions with a pejorative meaning in connection with God were rendered.

89 B.Tal, Yebamoth 79a.

90 It is missing from only one MS (Neubauer, 151) in the Siphre tradition; see above p.26 n.9 and p.56.

91 See above p.55.

92 The list at Ex 15:7; see above, p.31, n.23.

Horowitz⁹³ and the Paris MS with its unusual list of thirteen.⁹⁴ Of the medieval commentators, Rashi, Radaq, Ibn Ezra and Levi b. Gershom comment on it as being a tiqqun sopherim, although Ibn Ezra is somewhat sceptical about interpreting it as such. Of the sources which supply "original" readings, all agree that it was עליך, "unto thee", so that the emendation involved simply consisted in the omission of the final kaph.

That this "original" is not merely a rabbinic invention may be shown by the fact that the LXX already reads ἐπὶ σοὶ, though the other versions, Targum, Vulgate and Syriac agree with the MT. Jerome, however, gives the same reading⁹⁵ as the Vetus Latina:⁹⁶ "et sum tibi oneri". Kennicott mentions the usual two MSS.⁹⁷

As regards the context, to read עלי instead of עליך immediately destroys the parallelism of the passage. The idea involved in becoming a burden to oneself is by no means impossible! Indeed, in Job's present condition he is certainly more of a burden to himself than to his Creator. This may be why Ibn Ezra states that, although it may be a tiqqun sopherim, in interpreting it, it is better to treat it as if it were not.⁹⁸ However, if the original idea was that Job was a burden to himself, it would not have been expressed thus in Hebrew; rather one of the reflexive forms would have been necessary.⁹⁹ The only other two instances in the Bible where mention is made of למשא with the verb היה, in the sense of being burdensome to, contain reference to another person, and are therefore not reflexive. The passage in 2 Sam 15:35¹⁰⁰ is a direct parallel, with reversal of persons involved, to the "original" form of Job 7:20, while 2 Sam 19:36 has the preposition אל instead of על. The majority of modern commentators accept the

93 See above, p.31,n.29.

94 See above, pp.49-50.

95 Cf. D. Vallarsius, ed. Hieronymi Operum. Vol. X. Job et Psalterium ex graecis exemplaribus sive ex Origenis hexaplari editione. Venice 1768 (2nd ed.).

96 Thus recorded by R. Holmes and J. Parsons, Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum variis lectionibus. Vol.3 (1823), Oxford 1798-1827.

97 See above, p.62,n.12.

98 ואהיה וג' תיקון סופרים אע"פ שפירושו כאשר הוא בלא תיקון נכון.

99 Cf. A. Ehrlich, Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel. Leipzig 1918, Vol.6, p.211: "Sich selbst zur Last sein oder es werden ist keine hebräische Sprachweise."

100 2 Sam 15:33: והיה עלי למשא.

2 Sam 19:36: למשא אל אדוני.

authenticity of tiqqunim tradition concerning this verse and incorporate the original reading in their text.¹⁰¹ The same is true of most modern translations of the Bible.¹⁰²

Here again, in view of the textual support of the LXX and Vetus Latina; of the strongly attested rabbinic tradition and its "original" reading which only required the omission of one consonant for emendation;¹⁰³ of arguments drawn from an analysis of the context, and of grammatical considerations, one can safely conclude that the original reading was in fact emended to the present MT and that Job 7:20 is an authentic tiqqun sopherim.

(d) 2 Samuel 16:12

אולי יראה יהוה בעוני (בעיני Q)

This desire in 2 Sam 16:12 forms part of David's patient reaction to a series of curses and insults addressed to him by a fellow tribesman of Saul, Shimei, son of Gera. That this verse contains a tiqqun sopherim is attested by a certain number of sources, from the Tanhuma onwards.¹⁰⁴ It is not present in the Codex Babylonicus list, in the Ginsburg no.204 list, in the Paris MS list of thirteen, nor in the list in Pugio Fidei, fol.548, apart from being entirely absent from the early lists in the Siphre and Mekhilta and the traditions citing these. In the sources which supply an "original" reading, there are at least four variations. The singular form

101 Cf. F. Delitzsch, Das Buch Iob. (BC), Leipzig 1876, pp.110-111; B. Duhm, Das Buch Hiob. (KHC), Freiburg im B. 1897, p.86; P. Dhorme, Le Livre de Job. (EB), Paris 1926, p.98f.; N. Peters, Hiob. (EH), Münster 1928, p.86; P. Szczygiel, Hiob. (HSAT), Bonn 1931, pp.66-67; A. Weiser, Das Buch Hiob. (ATD), Göttingen 1951, p.56; G. Höltscher, Das Buch Hiob. (HAT), Tübingen 1952, p.24; S. Terrien, Job. Neuchâtel 1963, p.35; G. Fohrer, Hiob. (KAT), Göttersloh 1963, p.164; F. Horst, Hiob. (BK), Neukirchen 1968, p.98; J. Lévêque, Job et son Dieu. (EB), Paris 1970, p.401; M. Pope, Job. (AB), New York 1973 (3rd ed.), pp.57-62; R. Gordis, The Book of Job, Commentary, New Translation, and Special Studies. New York 1978, pp.82-83. It is not accepted as a tiqqun by K. Budde, Das Buch Hiob. (HK), Göttingen 1896, p.35 or by S.R. Driver and G.B. Gray, Job. (ICC), Edinburgh 1921, part two, p.48.

102 Cf. HOTTP, Vol.3, Stuttgart 1977, p.14. The Committee responsible for this project gave a firm rating for the reading of the Septuagint and rabbinic traditions.

103 See above n.89.

104 See above, pp.55-57.

בְּעֵינָיו, "with his eye"¹⁰⁵ is closest to the MT (Qere), requiring only a change of suffix involving one consonant for an emendation, whereas the plural form, בְּעֵינָיו, "with his eyes"¹⁰⁶ is possibly more "logical" since a person usually looks with both eyes! The remaining two "original" readings are of less significance, since they are isolated readings and it is hard to see how they could have been at the root of a tiqqun.¹⁰⁷

To understand these proposed original readings, "with his eye/eyes", it should be noted that the textual form בְּעֵינָיו is considered to be an instance of Qere-Ketib, where the official reading, as given in the margin, is בְּעֵינִי, "on my eye". Thus, the official reading of this passage is: "Would that Yahweh would look upon my eye". However, according to the tiqqunim traditions mentioned above, this present reading is an emended one which once read: "Would that Yahweh would look with his eye/eyes". Once again, in the interests of avoiding an anthropomorphic expression, a correction was deemed necessary. Certainly the official Qere, "my eye" does not make smooth reading, and the medieval commentators, who do not mention a possible tiqqun here, base their remarks on the targumic interpretation: "on the tear of my eye" (i.e. on my weeping).¹⁰⁸

The textual witnesses attest a different tradition, which is related to the Ketib, and with the exception of the Targum and some few MSS of Kennicott,¹⁰⁹ would not seem to have been aware of the tradition represented by the Qere. The LXX reads: ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει μου; the Vulgate attests: "ad afflictionem meam"; the Syriac attests a similar meaning. All three readings suppose an original בְּעֵינִי, "on my affliction". In fact, the Ketib, "on my iniquity" does not run any smoother in the context than the Qere,

105 Cf. Constantinople and Mantua editions of the Tanḥuma, together with MSS, Neubauer 2491, 156 and de Rossi 261 (the remaining MSS cited on p. 57 above do not give any "original" reading for this case); al-Qirqisani, and the lists appended to the Diquqe and Okhlah. Cf. also, three MSS of Kennicott, see n.109 below.

106 Wilna edition of the Tanḥuma, Yalqut ha-Makhiri, BM 1425 and Pugio Fidei, fol. 243.

107 Cf. Ginsburg 206 (בְּעֵינָנוּ, "on our eyes") and Pugio Fidei, fol. 222 (בְּעֵינִי, "on his iniquity").

108 Cf. Rashi and Radaq. Radaq's further comment will be taken up later, see below, n.111.

109 Twenty MSS read בְּעֵינִי as Ketib; three MSS read בְּעֵינָיו as Ketib (nos 86, 155 and 225).

The point made by de Rossi as regards the pausal form for this word¹¹⁵ deserves attention, in an attempt to show how the Ketib may be related to the form attested by the Versions. עני in its pausal form, without a suffix, is usually rendered as עני in the Bible; the only exception to this form is found at Ps 107:41, where it is written plene.¹¹⁶ When it has a suffix, the accent changes, so that the normal pausal form of עני is simply עני. In this context, de Rossi's observation, "Plene occurrit ob accentum et pausam", may seem out of place, or not in keeping with the system of accentuation attached to the vocalised text, but examination of the variant forms of the other four instances of עני in an accentuated position is revealing, especially in the case of Ps 119:92 and its variants, בעוני and בעוני.¹¹⁷ These provide a perfect illustration, from the point of view of textual criticism, of what must have happened with the Ketib for 2 Sam 16:12. In fact, Kennicott notes three MSS for 2 Sam 16:12 which omit the waw¹¹⁸ and two more with the form בעוני,¹¹⁹ which coincides exactly with the form presupposed by the Versions.

In view of these illustrations of the possible variant readings for עני, variants which are due to differences of orthography or to errors in copying, rather than to any theological motivation, there should be no difficulty in accepting the textual form of the Ketib as a peculiar orthographical form of the original reading,¹²⁰ which was already the Vorlage

115 See above, n.110.

116 Ps 107:41: מעוני. Of the nine other instances, Kennicott records a number of variants for each case, where it is also written plene.

117	BHK/L(B19 ^A)	VARIANTS	VARIANTS
Gen 41:52	...עני	...עוני (1 MS)	-
Ps 119:50	...עני	...בעוני (3 MSS)	...עני (1 MS)
Ps 119:92	...עני	...בעוני (4 MSS)	...עני (1 MS)
Job 10:15	...עני	...בעוני (3 MSS)	-

118 MSS no.s 4, 198, 282. So too, de Rossi; see above, n.110.

119 MSS no.150 (Berlin, 13th c.) and 224 (Königsberg). These variants can be explained as either copyists' errors or as forms influenced by an exegesis of the Ketib such as that attested by Radaq.

120 Cf. Ginsburg, Introduction, p.184: "It is now admitted by the best textual critics that in many instances the reading exhibited in the text is preferable to the marginal variants, inasmuch as it sometimes preserves the archaic orthography and sometimes gives the original reading. The Ketiv or textual reading moreover is in many instances not only supported by the MSS and early editions, but also by the Ancient Versions." In spite of these observations, both of which are

of the Ancient Versions other than the Targum.¹²¹

Accepting that the original reading is that preserved by the Versions and the Ketib means that the foundation upon which the tiqqunim tradition for this verse rests must be false. Consequently, as in the case of Gen 18:22, this is another instance where later rabbinic traditions created a tiqqun.¹²² Whatever the origin of the Qere,¹²³ the difficulty it presented¹²⁴ was already felt by the Targum,¹²⁵ and it may have been this difficulty that prompted rabbinic ingenuity to look for another explanation. This they found in the phenomenon of the tiqqune sopherim, particularly, perhaps in the one which served as a point of reference, on the lips of both Joshua ben Levi¹²⁶ and Judah ben Ilay,¹²⁷ namely Zech 2:12. Here was a ready-made parallel, for the original form there, עֵינִי, was corrected to עֵינִי.¹²⁸ Inspired, perhaps, by what happened in this verse of Zechariah, the supposed correction in 2 Sam 16:12 was intended to avoid what would have been too anthropomorphic if it had been the original reading!

(e) 2 Samuel 20:1, 1 Kings 12:16 and 2 Chronicles 10:16

<u>2 Samuel 20:1</u>	<u>1 Kings 12:16</u>	<u>2 Chronicles 10:16</u>
אִין לְנו חֶלֶק בְּדוֹד	מֵה לְנו חֶלֶק בְּדוֹד	מֵה לְנו חֶלֶק בְּדוֹד
וְלֹא נַחֲלָה לְנוּ בֶּן יִשִׁי	וְלֹא נַחֲלָה בֶּן יִשִׁי	וְלֹא נַחֲלָה בֶּן יִשִׁי
אִישׁ לֹאֲהֲלִינוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל	לֹאֲהֲלִין יִשְׂרָאֵל	אִישׁ לֹאֲהֲלִין יִשְׂרָאֵל
	עֲתָה רֵאֵה בֵּיתְךָ דָּוִד	עֲתָה רֵאֵה בֵּיתְךָ דָּוִד

truly pertinent to the case under examination, 2 Sam 16:12, Ginsburg rejects the readings of both Ketib and Versions, and accepts the rabbinic traditions built upon the Qere as recording the original for this verse! Cf. p.355 of his Introduction.

- 121 Which may or may not have been aware of this textual tradition in its commentary of "on my eye". See below, n.125.
- 122 It is noteworthy that this case is entirely absent from all the earlier lists up to those of the Tanhuma and al-Qirqisani.
- 123 The variant tradition may have come about in much the same way as in the case of the Ketib, as illustrated above, n.117. Cf. in particular, the variants recorded by Kennicott for Ps 119:50. The simplest explanation of the Qere may therefore be that of a purely material error.
- 124 Cf. Ginsburg, op. cit., p.355: "We have to resort to artificial explanations to obtain a tolerable sense."
- 125 By inserting "tears", the sense runs smoother.
- 126 See above, pp.37-38.
- 127 See above, pp.25-30.

These three parallel verses are grouped together for a common examination. The second and third cases form part of parallel accounts of the secession of the northern tribes after Solomon's death, while the former has a similar background, the revolt of the Benjaminite, Sheba, son of Bichri. The earliest reference to any of these verses (i.e. 2 Sam 20:1) is found in the Mekhilta and in one of its citations in the Yalqut Shime'oni.¹²⁹ 1 Kings 12:16 only is present in the Siphre Zuṭṭa and Midrash Haggadol, and from the Tanḥuma onwards, both 1 Kings 12:16, and its parallel in 2 Chron 10:16, are featured more or less consistently.¹³⁰ In some of the Masoretic lists these two cases are further subdivided¹³¹ to make four cases, but there is no list among those investigated, where all three are recorded simultaneously.¹³²

Among the sources which provide the "original" reading, there is agreement that the present MT text is an emended form of לאלהיו, "to his gods" (2 Sam 20:1) or לאלהיך, "to your gods" (1 Kings 12:16; 2 Chron 10:16), thereby implying that the revolts against the house of David involved more than mere political strife or tribal jealousy. According to the tiqqunim tradition, these revolts are interpreted in terms of religious infidelity, a path often taken in the course of Israel's history. Both Rashi and Radaq, in so far as they comment on any of these verses, do not refer to the existence of a possible tiqqun, and would seem to presuppose the MT as the basis of any relevant comment.

In each of the three cases, the textual witnesses are more or less unanimous in attesting the MT, the only slight suggestion of a variant being one MS of Kennicott,¹³³ which reads לאלהיו for לאלהיך in 2 Sam 20:1.

128 See above, pp.61-70.

129 The list at Ex 15:7. It is missing in the list at 1 Sam 3:13, probably through haplography (see above, p.26, n.9). 2 Sam 20:1 reappears again in the list appended to Ma'ase Ephod and in the list in Pugio Fidei, fol.243, and in both lists the other parallels of Kings and Chronicles are absent.

130 See above, p.55.

131 Cf. the two lists in the Codex Babylonicus and Ginsburg no.204.

132 Apart from the Siphre and its citation in both the Yalqut Shime'oni at Num 11:15 and Pugio Fidei, fol.669, the only list which does not contain any of these parallels is in Pugio Fidei, fol.548 (and the second list of the Yalqut Shime'oni mentioned in n.129 above).

133 MS 257. Kennicott also mentions MS 683'n à propos of 1 Kings 12:16 and 2 Chron 10:16; see above, p.62, n.12.

Here, as in the case of Gen 18:22, one is confronted with rabbinic traditions and their proposed "original" on the one hand, and with a unanimous textual tradition supporting the MT on the other hand. And here, as in the case of Gen 18:22,¹³⁴ there exist other midrashic traditions apart from the lists, which may help to unravel some of the paths which led to the formation of these three tiqqune sopherim.

These other midrashic traditions centre on an interpretation of 1 Sam 8:7, a verse which describes how it is Yahweh, and not Samuel, whom the Israelites have rejected in asking for a king. They are recorded in the Midrash Shemuel,¹³⁵ in the Yalqut Shime'oni¹³⁶ which cites this Midrash, and they are also reflected in the commentaries of Rashi and Radaq on Hos 3:5. Although these sources are late and therefore probably reflect a more developed form of the tradition, nevertheless, the persons to whom these various logia are attributed, Simeon ben Yoḥai¹³⁷ and his pupil, Simeon bar Menasia,¹³⁸ belong to the early centuries. The tradition begins, in the name of R. Simeon ben Yoḥai, by referring to 1 Kings 12:16¹³⁹ as illustrating three different rejections made by Israel, namely, the rejection of the Kingdom of Heaven, of the Kingdom of David and of the Sanctuary, followed by a logion of Simeon bar Menasia, who, in interpreting Hos 3:5, enumerates three ways in which Israel will once more return to the Kingdom of Heaven, the Kingdom of David, and the Sanctuary.¹⁴⁰ The second logion

134 See above, pp. 74-76.

135 Cf. Warsaw ed., 1873 (reprinted in Jerusalem 1960), par. 13, p.24; ed. Buber, Midrasch Shemuel, Cracow 1893 (reprinted in Jerusalem 1965), p.84.

136 Cf. Salonica ed. (1526-27), Part II, par. 106; I. Goldman ed., Warsaw 1876-77, Part II, p.720.

137 Cf. W. Bacher, Die Agada der Tannaiten, Vol. 2, pp.123-24, who briefly refers to this logion when dealing with Simeon ben Yoḥai (c.130-160 A.D.), but with no further reference as to its source other than Midrash Shemuel.

138 W. Bacher, *ibid.*, Vol. 2, p.77, mentions Simeon bar Menasia as one of Simeon ben Yoḥai's pupils, and refers to his logion on p.491, also giving Midrash Shemuel as his only source.

139 Although the text cited in the Yalqut Shime'oni is that of 2 Sam 20:1, the context is obviously that of 1 Kings 12:16, "In the days of Jeroboam ...".

140 The following translation is based on the Midrash Shemuel passage (the phrase between the asterisks below denotes the point at which the Yalqut Shime'oni and one MS of Midrash Shemuel differ (see below, n.142):
And the LORD said to Samuel, "Hearken to the voice of the people..."
R. Simeon ben Yoḥai said: "'It is not you that they have rejected, but they have rejected me from being king over them.'" (1 Sam 8:7).

is reproduced more or less identically by the Midrash Shemuel, the Yalqut Shime'oni, Rashi and Radaq, but there are noteworthy differences between the sources in the reproduction of Simeon ben Yoḥai's logion. The Yalqut Shime'oni citation of Midrash Shemuel is more or less identical with the text in Buber's edition, with one difference. Instead of linking the rejection of the Sanctuary to the phrase, "Each man to your tents", there occurs an al-tiqre,¹⁴¹ which proposes the reading, "Each man to his gods". This al-tiqre is also found in a MS of Midrash Shemuel.¹⁴² Rashi and Radaq differ more radically in that their presentation of Simeon ben Yoḥai's logion entails a different order in the interpretation of 1 Kings 12:16. The first idea, "We have no portion in David", does not, as in the other two Midrashim, refer to the rejection of Heaven, but to that of the Kingdom of David; "Now look to your own house, David" is interpreted as the rejection of the Sanctuary, and "Each man to your tents" in its al-tiqre form, refers to the rejection of the Kingdom of Heaven. Thus, they too include the al-tiqre¹⁴³ already mentioned above, but in a slightly changed way.

In three things they were ready to reject: the Kingdom of Heaven, the Kingdom of David and the Sanctuary Building. When did they reject these three things? In the days of Jeroboam, for it is written: 'And the Israelites saw and said, What portion have we in David?'; this refers to the Kingdom of Heaven, and 'We have no inheritance in the son of Jesse'; this refers to the Kingdom of David, 'Each man to your tents, O Israel,* now look to your own house, David'; this refers to the Sanctuary Building.*" Simeon bar Menasia said: "Israel will never see a good omen until she repents and seeks these three things again. For this is what is written (Hos 3:5): 'Afterwards the Israelites will return and seek the LORD, their God'; this refers to the Kingdom of Heaven, 'And David their king'; this refers to the Kingdom of the house of David, 'And they shall come in fear to the LORD, their God'; this refers to the Sanctuary."

- 141 The formula, "al-tiqre ... ella ..." is a common one in midrashic interpretation, the aim of which is to facilitate an interpretation other than that immediately linked to the text in question. Sometimes it involved another reading through a revocalisation; other times, it involved changing the consonantal text, but for purposes of exegesis only. For further details on the use of this exegetical device, see below, Ch. 4.
- 142 S. Buber, *op. cit.*, p.84n., observes that the MS 563 of de Rossi, Parma, of this Midrash has the fuller text with the al-tiqre: ולא לבית המקדש אל תקרי לאהליו אלא לאלהיו. This fuller text is present in the Salonica edition (1526-27) of the Yalqut Shime'oni, as well as that of the Warsaw edition (1876-77).
- 143 "Do not read 'to your tents', but 'to your gods'."

The allusion to this tradition in the Zohar¹⁴⁴ is not sufficiently explicit to be of any real help in an attempt to evaluate the diverging interpretations of this logion. Nevertheless, it has points of contact, on the one hand, with the threefold rejection and return as found in Midrash Shemuel and the Yalquṭ, as opposed to Rashi and Radaq, while on the other hand, like the Yalquṭ, Rashi and Radaq, it would seem to have been aware of the al-tiqre form, "to your/his gods".

Is it possible to decide which of the interpretations of R. Simeon's logion is the more authentic, and whether the al-tiqre phrase, absent from the two editions of Midrash Shemuel,¹⁴⁵ really formed part of the earliest core of the tradition? If definite answers could be given to these two questions, there would be a relatively clear-cut path towards identifying the way in which these passages were given tiqqun status. But such definite answers cannot be given in view of the distance in time between Simeon ben Yoḥai and the period during which these later Midrashim were compiled, and in view of the lack of any earlier sources recording this tradition.

Instead, it is hoped that some observations resulting from an analysis of the tradition in its present diverging forms, will provide sufficient basis for concluding that it was in the process of elaborating the tradition of Israel's threefold rejection of Yahweh and her threefold return, that the tiqqun which underlies 2 Sam 20:1 and parallels was created. Essentially, the tradition would seem to have consisted in a comparison of 1 Kings 12:16 or 2 Sam 20:1 with Hos 3:5, in which the former provided material for the interpretation of a threefold rejection, to which corresponded a threefold return, according to the interpretation of the latter. Both texts were drawn together in order to elaborate on and interpret the rejection of the LORD described in 1 Sam 8:7. According to the form of the tradition recorded in Midrash Shemuel and Yalquṭ Shime'oni, there is perfect symmetry between the order of rejection as based on the

144 Cf. J. de Pauly, Zohar. Paris 1909, Vol. 4, pp.132-33: "C'est pour cette raison que Jacob prit le nom d'Israël qui indique un degré supérieur. De même 'David, fils de Jessé' indique un degré supérieur à celui désigné simplement sous le nom 'David'. Ceci correspond à l'enseignement de la tradition d'après lequel Israël ne fut exilé que pour avoir nié l'existence de Dieu, et le règne de David, ainsi qu'il est écrit: nous n'avons plus part en David, ni héritage dans le fils de Jessé; que chacun retourne sous ses tentes". Le dernier mot désigne les idoles."

145 See above, nn.140 and 142.

2 Sam 20:1/1 Kings 12:16 texts and the order of return, as based on the Hos 3:5 text.¹⁴⁶ If the simplest form of the tradition did not contain the al-tiqre, the basis for interpreting "to your tents" as a rejection of the Sanctuary might have been the connection with the 'Ohel Mo'ed' which had been given permanent residence in the building of the Temple.

The other form of the logion, as recorded in Rashi and Radaq in their commentaries on Hos 3:5, runs smoothly from the point of meaning, but for that reason, as well as the fact that the symmetry in the order of ideas is thereby upset,¹⁴⁷ it may well represent a later "retouching" of the interpretation attested in Midrash Shemuel. Geiger is of the opinion that this form attested in Rashi and Radaq belongs to a later stage in the evolution of the tradition, than the form attested in the Yalqut.¹⁴⁸ He also considers that the original tradition read "to your gods", since he considers this to have been the original reading of the biblical text.

The actual presence of the al-tiqre formula in part of the traditions gives some clue as to the origins of a tiqqun for these three verses under consideration. The fact that the meaning resulting from the use of the al-tiqre implied idolatry of a very serious nature must have been sufficient grounds for the introduction of a tiqqun to hide the nature of this outrage. It is not possible to determine precisely when this tiqqun tradition was created, but it must have its roots quite far back,¹⁴⁹ in spite of the relatively late traditions recorded in Midrash Shemuel and the Yalqut. In any event, it is more prudent to abide by the unanimous textual tradition which

146 Threefold Rejection

- a) We have no portion in David (Kingdom of H.)
- b) We have no inheritance in the son of Jesse (Kingdom of David)
- c) Each man to his tents O Israel (Sanctuary)

Threefold Return

- a) And they shall seek the LORD, their God (Kingdom of H.)
- b) And David, their king, (Kingdom of David)
- c) And they shall come in fear to the LORD (Sanctuary)

147 Threefold Rejection

- b) We have no portion in David (to be taken literally)
- a) To your tents O Israel do not read 'to your tents' but 'to your gods'
- c) Now see to your own house (Sanctuary)

Threefold Return

- a) And they shall seek the LORD, (Kingdom of Heaven)
- b) And David, their king (to be taken literally)
- c) And they shall come in fear to the LORD (Sanctuary)

148 Cf. op. cit., p.316n.

149 2 Sam 20:1 appears as early as the Mekhilta lists. The al-tiqre formula was frequently in use at this period also, see below, pp.160ff.

upholds the MT, rather than follow traditions which are concerned with the a posteriori accommodation of one text to another in the interpretation of a third. An added motive for distrusting rabbinic traditions in this instance, in favour of the more solid ground of textual evidence, is the somewhat analogous case of Gen 18:22, which became a tiqqun in later rabbinic circles in order to strengthen or further illustrate an interpretation of another text.¹⁵⁰

Finally, apart from the above considerations of rabbinic interpretation, modern commentators base their comments on the MT, and see no need to mention the existence of the tiqqunim tradition.¹⁵¹ They find no difficulty in interpreting the verses in terms of the latent hostility of the tribes, with political rather than religious overtones.¹⁵² Moreover, the expression, "A man to his tent/s" is by no means an uncommon one, especially in the books of Judges, Samuel and Kings,¹⁵³ so that there is no motive from either phraseological, contextual or textual considerations which requires any reading other than that of the MT. It can be concluded, therefore, that these three cases of 2 Sam 20:1, 1 Kings 12:16 and 2 Chron 10:16, and their sub-division into two further cases in certain lists, cannot be accepted as recording genuine scribal emendations.

(f) Ezekiel 8:17

והנם שלחים את הזמורה אל אפס

In the Temple Vision (Chapters 8 - 11), Ezekiel is shown the "abomination after abomination that the house of Israel are committing" (8:6ff.). The climax is reached when he is led to the inner court of the house of the LORD, for there,

At the door of the Temple of the LORD, between the porch and the altar, were about twenty-five men, with their backs to

¹⁵⁰ See above, pp.74-76.

¹⁵¹ There may be some connection between this and the fact that BHK (all editions) and BHS do not mention the tiqqunim tradition in their critical apparatus for these parallel verses. See above, p.17, n.3.

¹⁵² As a typical expression of such comments, cf. M. Noth, Könige I, 1-16, (BK), Neukirchen 1968, pp.276-77.

¹⁵³ Cf. Judg 7:8; 19:9; 20:10; 1 Sam 4:10; 13:2; 2 Sam 18:17; 19:9; 20:22; 2 Kings 14:12; 2 Chron 25:22, etc. Note that J. Levy, op. cit., Vol.2 p.350b, suggests that Deut 1:27 (באהליכם) was originally באלהיכם or באהלו, but against this, see W. Bacher, Terminologie, Vol. 1, p.84, n.3.

the Temple of the LORD, and their faces towards the east, worshipping the sun, towards the east. (8:16).

In the angry outburst which follows upon witnessing the climax of this conducted tour, Yahweh exclaims:

Is it too slight a thing for the house of Judah to commit the abominations which they commit here that they should fill the land with violence and provoke me to anger? Lo, they put the branch to their nose. (8:17).

It is this last phrase which rabbinic traditions include among the kinnuyim/tiqqunim instances.¹⁵⁴ For them it camouflages an original blasphemous, and according to their perspective, indecent¹⁵⁵ idea, "They put the branch to my nose".

But the rabbis were not the only ones who found this verse thorny. From the various renderings of the Versions, it is clear that they too encountered a certain amount of difficulty. The LXX^B translates by replacing the actual description of the offensive action (they put the branch to the nose) by the effect of the action, "they insult": καὶ ἰδοὺ αὐτοὶ ὡς μυκτηρίζοντες. The remaining greater part of the LXX tradition, influenced by Origen's recension, inserts ἐκτείνουσιν τὸ κλημα before ὡς μυκτηρίζοντες. In a similar attempt to bring the LXX into closer harmony with the Hebrew text, Aquila and Theodotion read respectively: πρὸς μυκτηῖρα αὐτῶν and εἰς τὸν μυκτηῖρα αὐτῶν.¹⁵⁶ Finally, a number of MSS, classified by Ziegler as being within the Lucianic recension,¹⁵⁷ have the following reading: καὶ ἰδοὺ αὐτοὶ ὡς μυκτηρίζοντες με.¹⁵⁸ The Targum translates זמורה, "branch" by כחמא, "shame", while the Syriac omits it completely. Only the Vulgate translates the MT faithfully, "et ecce applicant ramum ad nares suas".

From this brief survey of the various renderings of the Versions, two observations may be made. Firstly, the rite alluded to in Ez 8:17 was obviously not one with which the various translators of Ezekiel were intimately acquainted. The context would only have helped them in guessing

154 This case is missing only from the list in the Diquque appendix, and the two Masoretic lists of "thirteen", the Paris MS and BM Add. 21,161.

155 See below, nn.160-161.

156 Symmachus is more venturesome and less helpful: καὶ ὡς ἀφύεντες εἰσὶν ἦχον ὡς ἄσμα δόξα τῶν μυκτηῖρων αὐτῶν, which Jeromes renders as "quasi emittentes sonitum in similitudinem cantici per nares suas."

157 Ezechiel, Göttingen 1952, p.121: 62(Oxford, 11th c.); z(Vatican, 7th-8th c.); 311(Moscow, 12th c.); Theodoret.

158 See following note.

that it was some form of action not pleasing to Yahweh. Secondly, varied though these attempts at translating may be, none of them¹⁵⁹ reflects the proposed original of the tiqqunim traditions.

It is to these traditions that one must now return. A study of the many rabbinic and exegetical passages centering on the explanation of Ez 8:17 will reveal that the main problem for them was not so much the "original" reading, "my nose" in place of "their nose", but rather the interpretation of זמורה, "branch". Two positions may be distinguished, though relatively close to each other and equally indecent. One series of texts sees in the zemorah of Ez 8:17 the phallus,¹⁶⁰ while the other interprets it as the crepitus ventris.¹⁶¹ Given this state of affairs and rabbinic ingenuity, it is not surprising to find this verse being treated in certain circles as a tiqqun sopherim,¹⁶² especially in view of the fact that it already figures among the Siphre-Mekhilta euphemisms. The interpretation of Ez 8:16, "With their backs towards the Temple of the LORD" in Yoma 77a is a further illustration of the rabbinic imagination which helped to promote these interpretations of zemorah.¹⁶³

Keeping in mind the difficulty encountered by the Versions in translating Ez 8:17, it is possible that the בִּהְתָּח, "shame" of the Targum to some extent prompted¹⁶⁴ or reflected the lines adopted in the rabbinic schools.

159 The reading of a section of the Lucianic recension, ὡς μυστηριόζοντες με, must be seen as a later attempt to clarify a difficult expression, and as quite unrelated to the rabbinic traditions.

160 Pesiqta Rabbati, par.7. Cf. ed. M. Friedmann, Pesikta Rabbati, Midrasch für den Fest-Cyclus und die ausgezeichneten Sabbate, Wien 1880, fol. 26b. This tradition is also found in Numbers Rabbah XIII,3, where the זמורה of the Pesiqta Rabbati text is rendered as זכריות, but the interpretation of zemorah remains unchanged. Another parallel tradition is found in the Pesiqta de Rab Kahana, Zachor III,11. This tradition is partially cited by Nathan ben Yehiel in his Aruch, is found in the Tanḥuma, Teṣe' 10, and is in turn cited in Yalqut Shime'oni, Part II, par. 348.

161 Cf. Menahem ben Saruq, Sepher ha-Mahaberet (ed. Filipovski, London 1854); Abulwalid, Sepher ha-Shorashim (ed. W. Bacher, Berlin 1896) and the commentaries of Rashi and Radaq.

162 Radaq, after interpreting zemorah as being the crepitus ventris, goes on to describe this verse as one of the eighteen tiqqune sopherim and furnishes the original reading, whereas Rashi, interpreting zemorah in like manner, omits all reference to this verse as being a tiqqun.

163 "'With their backs to the Temple of the LORD'. It teaches that they uncovered themselves and committed a nuisance towards that which is below." (Yoma 77a). Concerning the substitute expression, "that which is below", see below, p.176, n.48.

It is hardly likely that these latter were any better informed than the translators of the LXX, etc., as to what precisely the condemned practice consisted of, other than knowing that it was deserving of divine censure.

Because zemorah, elsewhere classified in the Bible¹⁶⁵ as shoot, twig or branch,¹⁶⁶ could also have the connotation "phallus" in rabbinic and later Hebrew,¹⁶⁷ it is not difficult to see in this fact the beginnings of one of the later more elaborated explanations of zemorah in Ez 8:17 as symbolising the phallus.¹⁶⁸ The origins of the other position, crepitis ventris, are most likely to be sought in a somewhat similar atmosphere of exegesis, encouraged by the Targum, and founded more on imagination than on etymology.

Very many modern commentators cite these rabbinic traditions to uphold their interpretation of zemorah¹⁶⁹ and/or to substantiate their adoption of the scribal emendation.¹⁷⁰ Yet the absence of any textual support

164 Note how Rashi and Radaq both cite the Targum as upholding their exegesis of zemorah.

165 Num 13:23; Is 17:10; Ez 15:2; Nahum 2:3.

166 From the root זמר, "to prune".

167 Cf. J. Levy, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p.544, and see n.160 above. This connotation was already present in cognate languages such as Arabic (cf. H.W.F. Saggs, "The Branch to the Nose", *JThS* 11 (1960) p.236, n.7; S. Spiegel, "Ezekiel or Pseudo-Ezekiel?", *HThR* 24 (1931) p.299, n.52). It is possible that "the branch" in this verse had some symbolic relationship with the phallus, as is possible in some of the other biblical passages where zemorah is used (cf. Is 17:10). See below, n.178.

168 See above, n.160.

169 For zemorah = phallus: cf. A. Geiger, *op. cit.*, p.325; A. Bertholet, Hezekiel, (KHC), Freiburg im B. 1897, p.50; W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel, (BK), Neukirchen 1969, p.222; W. McKane, *op. cit.*, pp.73-75.
For zemorah = crepitis ventris: cf. S. Lieberman, *op. cit.*, p.33, n.37; A. van den Born, Ezechiel, Roermond en Maaseik 1954, pp.64-65; W. Eichrodt, Der Prophet Hesekiel, (ATD), Göttingen 1959, p.62.
For zemorah = (Opfer-)gestank: R. Kraetzschmar, Das Buch Ezechiel, (HK), Göttingen 1900, pp.96-97; P. Heinisch, Das Buch Ezechiel, (HSAT), Bonn 1923, pp.58-59.

170 Cf. Geiger, Ginsburg, Lieberman, Bertholet, Kraetzschmar, Heinisch, van den Born, Eichrodt, Zimmerli, McKane, G. Fohrer and K. Galling, Ezechiel, (HAT), Tübingen 1955, pp. 51-52.
Commentators who do not accept the tiqqun for this verse, but retain the MT include C.H. Cornill, Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel, Leipzig 1886, p.227 and G. Cooke, Ezekiel, (ICC), Edinburgh 1951 (2nd ed.), p.100.

for this "correction" remains a major obstacle. The difficulty in understanding the rite alluded to in Ez 8:17 must not be minimised; but neither should later midrashic and rabbinic interpretations on their own be accepted as providing the answer,¹⁷¹ for, as already noted, there is no guarantee that the rabbis were any less puzzled by this verse than were the translators of the Versions.

In view of the time interval between Ezekiel's period and that of the Versions and rabbinic traditions, perhaps it would be more rewarding to seek a background to the practice referred to in this verse in a study of earlier and contemporary near-eastern literary and archeological data. Frequent allusion has been made to the Persian barçema,¹⁷² but with vague and unconvincing results. More recently, in the course of a study of this verse, Saggs¹⁷³ mentions a number of literary and archeological findings both from the Sumero-Akkadian period¹⁷⁴ and from the later Babylonian¹⁷⁵

-
- 171 Nor should some of the varied modern attempts, as for instance, that of N.M. Sarna, "Ezekiel 8:17, a Fresh Examination", HThR 57 (1964) 347-352: "For see, they send out the strong men to execute their anger/to anger me"; his explanation is based on the relationship he sees between zemorah and the Semitic root dmr, strong. Nor that of R. Gordis, "Ezekiel 8:17", JThS 37 (1936) 284-88: "They send the branch into my nose = they harass and irritate me". Noteworthy is the existence of another rabbinic tradition which accepts the MT and makes no allusion to this verse as having been corrected. This tradition is found in the Pesiqta de Rab Kahana XVI,10; Lamentations Rabbah I,22,57; Pesiqta Rabbati XXXIII and Yalqut Shime'oni II,445 and it lists the various members of the body by which Israel sinned against God (the hands, ears, eyes, nose, etc.). Ez 8:17 is cited as the instance when Israel sinned נפסו.
- 172 For an account of the history of this position and of some of the difficulties such an interpretation meets with, cf. S. Spiegel, op. cit., pp.298-301. Cf. NEB: "Even while they seek to appease me" (footnote: lit. "Hold twigs to their nostrils").
- 173 H.W. Saggs, "The Branch to the Nose", JThS 11 (1960) 318-329.
- 174 "Sumero-Akkadian religion does, however, throw light upon this, for both in the art (particularly glyptic art - here Saggs mentions twelve examples from H. Frankfort, Stratified Cylinder Seals from the Diyala Region) and in the texts there occur many instances of the ritual gesture in which the worshipper, in confronting the deity, usually in a standing position, placed his hand before his mouth or nose ... In Sumerian the compound ka šu-gál, literally, 'to place the hand upon the mouth (or nose)' was the usual term for 'to show reverence (to the deity)' ..." (p.320).
- 175 "The bronze relief AO 20185 in the Louvre ... depicts a male and female worshipper, identified as Esarhaddon and his mother Naqi'a, both standing facing the same direction and holding in the right hand, pressed up against the nose, an object apparently cylindrical in shape

period, involving gestures somewhat parallel to that mentioned in Ez 8:17, which permits him to make the following conclusion:

"The branch to the nose" rite of Ez 8:17 may therefore be considered to be paralleled in the Mesopotamian milieu in two main respects, namely in the form and manner of the gesture and in the sun-god as the primary object of worship. 176

While this type of material¹⁷⁷ should not be considered as indicating exactly what took place in Ez 8:17, it certainly provides a surer basis from which to offer suggestions than the various rabbinic traditions cited above which would advocate an emendation. Job 31:27, "And my mouth has kissed my hand", may also help to illustrate the background to such idolatrous practices. The zemorah of Ez 8:17 may have been in some way connected with fertility rites and might possibly have symbolised the phallus,¹⁷⁸ but this in itself is not sufficient reason for changing the MT or adopting some¹⁷⁹ later rabbinic traditions as being the authentic interpretation for this obscure verse. The conclusions already reached regarding the supposed

and represented as being about six inches in length and an inch in diameter. One may conclude almost certainly that the worshippers were originally depicted as approaching a deity or deities or divine symbols ... (p.321).

Similar or apparently related representations are found elsewhere in the New Assyrian period. On seal-impressions on documents found at Nimrud, Sennacherib is depicted standing facing a god identified as Aššur: in his right hand the king holds before his nose something resembling a small rod, of about the same apparent dimensions as those held by Esarhaddon and Naqi'a in AO 20185." (p.321).

Saggs gives two further examples from this period and concludes with other varying illustrations of objects held to the nose (pp.322-23) and concludes: "The 'branch to the nose' rite in Ezekiel could have been a form of, or imitation of, a compound ritual gesture of which both elements occurred in Sumerian religion from earliest times, and of which the compound form may have been known and referred to in the Sumerian or immediate post-Sumerian period and was certainly well attested in later Assyrian religion, particularly in the reigns of Sennacherib and Esarhaddon. The latter, was, however, the very period at which Judah was most strongly exposed to Assyrian influence, in its religion as well as in its politics." (pp.323-324).

He then cites 2 Kings 21:2-6, where Manasseh not only revived various Canaanite cults but also introduced astral worship.

176 Op. cit., p.329.

177 Cf. also A. Jirku, "Neues keilschriftliches Material zum Alten Testament", ZAW 39 (1921) 144-160 (no.13 zu Ez 8:17, p.160); J. Pritchard, ANET, p.48; idem, ANEP no.s 29, 132, 407 and 463.

178 Cf. Saggs, op. cit., p.326; see above, n.167.

179 See above, n.171, which cites other rabbinic traditions based on the MT.

corrections for Gen 18:22; 2 Sam 16:12; 20:1; 1 Kings 12:16 and 2 Chron 10:16 may be applied also to Ez 8:17, even if this case is very strongly attested in practically all the tiqqunim lists, etc., examined above in Ch.2. It would, therefore, be best to retain the MT, while indicating that the precise nature of the practice denounced by Yahweh is not clear.

(g) Hosea 4:7, Jeremiah 2:11 and Ps 106:20

Hos 4:7: כְּבוֹדָם בְּקִלּוֹן אָמִיר

Jer 2:11: וְעַמִּי הַמִּיר כְּבוֹדוֹ בְּלוֹא יוֹעִיל

Ps 106:20: וַיִּמְירוּ אֶת כְּבוֹדָם בַּחֲבִנִית שׁוֹר אֲכָל עֵשָׂב

Hos 4:7, Jer 2:11 and Ps 106:20 may be grouped together, since they each express, in almost identical fashion, an "exchange" of "glory"¹⁸⁰ for something less noble. In Hos 4:7, which forms part of Yahweh's severe condemnation of the corrupt Israelite priests who are leading his people astray, קִלּוֹן, "shame" is the correlative of the exchange. In Jer 2:11, the exchange involved is between "glory" and "that which is of no value". The context and parallelism with the first part of v.11, "Has ever a nation exchanged its gods", shows that it is certainly an attempt to describe Israel's apostasy¹⁸¹ from her God, her ever-recurring and most stigmatised sin. Ps 106:20 is a collective admission of guilt, "We have sinned as much as our fathers" (v.6), which recalls in v.20 the episode of the golden calf. The description of this apostasy is also expressed in terms of an exchange of "glory" for "the image of a grass-eating ox".

It is in the interpretation of the "glory" thus exchanged for something less noble that difficulties arise. For the fuller and more developed tiqqunim lists number all three instances as emended forms of an original "my glory", i.e., the glory of God. Left uncorrected, these phrases would have been disrespectful and offensive, according to the logic of the tiqqunim tradition, and hence the present MT third person plural suffix in Hos 4:7 and Ps 106:20 and the third person singular suffix in Jer 2:11 are seen as hiding, or at least softening, what would otherwise appear as blasphemous.

180 In all three cases the same verb, הִמִּיר ב..., "to exchange ... for", occurs, as well as the substantive כְּבוֹד, "glory". See below, pp.99ff, concerning the sense of "glory" in these passages.

181 The verb יָעַל in the hiph'il (to confer or gain profit) is also used in Jer 16:19; Is 44:9,10 and Hab 2:18, where, in each case, it designates the aspect of emptiness and folly in idols.

Such was the reasoning of the scribes, or at least the motivation underlying the inclusion of these texts among the tiqqunim lists.

(i) Hos 4:7. Of these three cases, Hos 4:7 is the least attested in the sources for the tradition. It is first recorded in the Tanhuma¹⁸² and al-Qirqisani lists and in a certain number of the Masoretic lists.¹⁸³ It is also present in all the Pugio Fidei lists except, of course, the one which reproduces the Siphre tradition. Among the sources which include the "original" reading, there is agreement that the original text had כְּבוֹדִי, "my glory".¹⁸⁴ However, the resulting phrase, "I will change my glory into shame" does not satisfy Geiger¹⁸⁵ and Ginsburg,¹⁸⁶ for,

It is evident from the context that this only partly exhibits the alteration which the Sopherim introduced here, since "I will change my glory into shame" is both against the context and against the principle which underlies these alterations.¹⁸⁷

They therefore adopt the third person plural verb of the Targum and Syriac Versions, "They have changed my glory ...",¹⁸⁸ so that the resulting text reads inversely to the MT.

But this "original" reading, "my glory", proposed by the medieval lists is not attested elsewhere. Rather, a unified textual tradition with the reading "their glory", casts doubts on the genuineness of this tiqqun. If it can be demonstrated that the traditional MT best fits the context, and if a plausible explanation as to the origin of this verse among the later tiqqunim traditions can be suggested, then these doubts will be shown to have had a firm foundation.

Leaving aside for the moment the interpretation of "glory", the structure of vv.6-7 in this passage of condemnation is revealing. For there is a certain causal relationship between sin and ensuing punishment in three successive couplets:

182 Its point of entry into the Tanhuma list is significant, immediately after Jer 2:11 and Ps 106:20, as these are reproduced in the same sequence from the Mekhilta. See above, p.35.

183 It is missing from the Babylonian Codex list, Ginsburg no.204, BM 1425, the Paris MS list and BM Add. 21,161.

184 Cf. Tanhuma, al-Qirqisani, the Okhlah list, Pugio Fidei (three lists) and Ginsburg no.206.

185 Cf. op. cit., p.316.

186 Introduction, p.357.

187 Ibid.

- v.6 As you have rejected knowledge
 So do I reject you from my priesthood.
You have forgotten the teaching of your God
I, in my turn, will forget your children.
- v.7 Many as they are, they have sinned against me
 I will change their glory into shame.

In the first part of each couplet, Yahweh denounces their sin and in the second part he indicates, verb in the first person singular each time, the corresponding punishment which will be meted out. The first two couplets consist of specific failures and specific punishments with a you - I - you sequence. The third is more generic and the corresponding punishment is likewise generic. The sequence here is they - I - they. A further argument in favour of "their glory" is the word play in v.7, כבודם--כבודם¹⁸⁹ which would be lost by the introduction of an arbitrary כבודי.

Apart from the structure of the verses, a more delicate and decisive question is whether it is necessary and inevitable that, like the tiqqunim traditions, one must interpret "glory" uniquely in the sense of divine glory, that divine glory which shrouds the mysterious and intangible being of the Almighty and which for man is an inadequate means of expressing the inexpressible?¹⁹⁰ If this were so, and if in this context of Hosea, it were obviously the only valid interpretation of "glory", one might have to admit that perhaps, after all, the scribes knew what they were doing.

But the context describes the priests' degradation. Their glory is to be changed into shame. The glory in question here is that which comes from being God's people, and more specifically, of being, in this context, priests of God's people. It is true that this glory may be considered as a reflection of God's glory, but it remains a human quality, its opposite being shame and degradation.¹⁹¹ Isaiah, the prophet who experienced his true wretchedness and uncleanness in the awesome presence of the LORD of hosts, whose glory fills the whole earth (Is 6), did not hesitate to qualify

188 It should be noted here, however, that although the Targum and Syriac read a third person plural verb, there is no hint of this extended "original" reading present in the tiqqunim traditions. Not only does the critical apparatus of BHS (K. Elliger) include reference to "their glory" as a tiq soph, but it also extends this qualification explicitly to the verb as well. BHK (3rd ed.) does not refer to Hos 4:7 as a tiqqun (see above, p.17, n.3). See below, n.196, regarding other commentators who also adopt the Targum verbal form as well as the tiqqun.

189 Cf. W. Rudolph, Hosea, (KAT), Göttersloh 1966, p.98.

190 Cf. D. Mollat, "Gloire" in VThB (1970) 504-510.

191 In Gen 45:13 Joseph commissions his brothers to give his father a full

the power and strength of the kingdoms of his time in terms of "glory". "The king of Assyria and all his glory" (8:7) will inundate Judah, while within three years "the glory of Moab" will cease to command respect (16:14). The fate of the remnant of Aram will be that of the "glory of the Israelites" (17:3) and "on that day the glory of Jacob will be brought low" (17:4).¹⁹² Thus Yahweh's punishing of the priests will consist in turning their glory, their privileged position in a privileged nation, into shame, precisely because they have failed to live up to the standard required for this position.¹⁹³

But what were the reasons which led to the inclusion of this verse of Hosea within the tiqqunim lists? Of the three cases, this one was obviously added at a later stage of expansion since it does not figure in any of the early traditions, from the Siphre up to the Midrash Haggadol.¹⁹⁴ It was probably included eventually because its terminology, "exchanging glory", was parallel to that of Jer 2:11 and Ps 106:20. So that if there had never been a Jer 2:11 or a Ps 106:20, it is doubtful whether Hos 4:7 would have reached the status of tiqqun in the medieval lists. For, as will be seen, the context of Jer 2:11 and Ps 106:20 is a condemnation of idolatry which lends itself to an easier identification of the glory in question with that of the epiphanic glory of Yahweh, whereas the context in Hosea is a condemnation of the priests' infidelity.¹⁹⁵

report of his high position, of all the honour he is enjoying in Egypt, while Job, in his sorry plight, is robbed of his glory (19:9).

192 Cf. also Is 21:16; Jer 48:18. Especially noteworthy is Is 61:6.

193 A number of commentators follow this line of interpretation and see no need to change either "their glory" or the verbal form. Cf. F. Hitzig, Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten, (KeH), Leipzig 1863 (3rd ed.), p.20; W. Nowack, op. cit., p.34; A. Weiser, op. cit., p.30; E. Jacob, Osée, Neuchâtel 1965, pp.39-41; W. Rudolph, op. cit., p.98; J. Mays, Hosea, (OTL), London 1975 (2nd ed.), p.66; the HOTTP Committee also favours the MT for both words, cf. Vol. 5 (in printing), p.232. See further below, n.196, for other commentators who also follow this interpretation of "glory", but who change the verb, following the Targum and Syriac, and invoke the tiqqune sopherim traditions by way of confirmation.

194 See above, n.182 and the charts on pp.35 and 55.

195 Granted that part of their infidelity consisted in some form of idolatry; cf. St. Jerome's commentary, Hieronymi Operum, Vol. 4, p.37: "Propterea gloriam eorum, in qua gloriabantur sibi, et Deo idola praeferrebant, in ignominiam commutabo." But this idea is not foremost in the thought of v.7, as it is in the other two texts. J. Mays, op. cit., renders a very apt translation of the MT: "I will change their honour to disgrace."

It is scarcely necessary to mention that, even apart from the problem of "their glory" being a scribal correction, the adoption of the Targum and Syriac third person plural verb remains arbitrary.¹⁹⁶ It might be best explained as a corruption due to translators or copyists, who, having no knowledge of these tiqqunim traditions, were possibly influenced by the textual forms of Jer 2:11 or Ps 106:20. All these observations should suffice to eliminate Hos 4:7 from the list of authentic tiqqunim. But this conclusion may not be automatically extended to the other two verses, for their situation is more complex.

(ii) Jer 2:11 and Ps 106:20. These two verses speak of an exchange of glory for a useless idol or a grass-eating ox. As in the case of Hos 4:7, the tiqqunim traditions consider that the present suffixes to glory in both texts are emended forms of an original "my glory".¹⁹⁷ Both cases are present in the earliest lists of kinuuyim¹⁹⁸ and reappear in the majority of the subsequent lists.¹⁹⁹ Ibn Ezra, in his commentary on Ps 106:20, cites this verse as containing a kinuuy "for the glory of the Name".²⁰⁰

The textual evidence for Jer 2:11 is firm in upholding the MT, כְּבוֹדוֹ, "its glory". The only variant reading is that of the Targum, which presents a midrashic development rather than an alternative "original" reading, and is therefore too free in its rendering to be of any value. On the other hand, the textual traditions for Ps 106:20 record a number of variants, but

196 Geiger and Ginsburg opt for a double correction. So too A. van Hoonacker, op. cit., p.45. Other commentators retain the MT, "their glory", but change the verb to plural, on the evidence of the Targum and Syriac, and make vague references to Jewish, Masoretic or tiqqunim traditions to support this alteration. Cf. K. Marti, op. cit., p.41; W. Harper, Amos and Hosea, (ICC), Edinburgh 1910, pp.256-57; K. Budde, "Zu Text und Auslegung des Buches Hosea", JBL 45 (1926) 280-97; J. Lippl, Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten, (HSAT), Vol. 1, Bonn 1937, p.41; H. Wolff, Hosea, (BK), Neukirchen 1961, p.88.

197 This "original" reading for Jer 2:11 is attested in the Siphre Zuṭṭa, Midrash Haggadol, Tanḥuma, al-Qirqisani, the lists appended to Diqduqe and to Ma'ase Ephod, the Okhlah list and the lists in Pugio Fidei, foll. 222,243 and 548. For Ps 106:20 it is attested in the Siphre quotation of Pugio Fidei, fol. 669, in the Siphre Zuṭṭa, Midrash Haggadol, al-Qirqisani, Tanḥuma, the list appended to the Diqduqe and the Okhlah list. Rashi also attests this original for Ps 106:20 in his commentary at Job 32:3.

198 Jer 2:11 is absent from one part of the Siphre textual tradition; see above, p.26, n.9 and p.28, n.13.

199 See above, p.55.

200 See below, n.207.

none of them coincides with the proposed "original" reading of rabbinic sources. Rather, a notable number of the textual witnesses²⁰¹ favour the MT, "their glory", which reading does not have any alternative forms recorded among the Hebrew MSS of Kennicott and de Rossi. These variants consist of:

- (a) Targum: "They have exchanged the glory of their LORD".
- (b) Some LXX MSS:²⁰² τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ.
- (c) A few LXX MSS:²⁰³ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ.
- (d) Rom 1:23: τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ.

The readings in (a), (c) and (d) would seem to reflect a common exegetical tradition which interpreted "their glory" as the glory of God. The remaining variant, (b), is possibly indirectly referring to this same tradition, for "his glory" must be "the glory of God". These variants will be referred to again in a later paragraph.

The proposed "original" of the rabbinic sources for Ps 106:20, "my glory", may be dismissed with relative ease. It has no textual support. It would be incongruous in a passage where God is referred to throughout in the third person, and only at the beginning and end (vv.4 and 47) in the second person, but never in the first, and finally, the considerations relative to the ingenuity of the scribes in providing "original" readings for other such tiqqunim apply equally here. Presuming that the present text was an emendation of the scribes to avoid blasphemy, certain rabbinic circles concluded that the "original" here, as in the case of many of the other tiqqunim, must have been been in the first person singular, referring to God, "my glory". The memory of such texts as Is 42:8,11, "I will not give my glory to another", would have undoubtedly strengthened their conviction.

But if the proposed "original" of rabbinic sources may be dismissed with relative ease, the question still remains as to why Ps 106:20 became a tiqqun. In other words, the interpretation of "glory" and the variant readings mentioned above must be tackled. It would be best to do this in liaison with Jer 2:11, which has a third person suffix, and which might have helped to further the exegetical tradition referred to above, which inter-

201 LXX: Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, 55 (Rom. Vat. 10th c.); Old Latin and Gallican Psalter; Bohairic; Syriac; Sahidic.

202 Cf. A. Rahlfs, Septuaginta X. Psalmi cum Odis, Göttingen 1967 (2nd ed.) p.266: R (Verona, 6th c.); L' (Lucianic recension and Theodoret); A' (Alexandrinus and MS 1219).

203 Ibid., L^{pau} (a few MSS from the Lucianic recension).

puted "their glory" as "his glory", i.e., the glory of God. If such a tradition existed also in the case of Jer 2:11, it would have been hidden in the ambiguity of the third person singular suffix.

Should one consider this proposed exegetical tradition, underlying the variant reading for Ps 106:20, and latently present for Jer 2:11, as representing the original interpretation of these verses? And in the case of Ps 106:20, should this involve changing the MT? The answer to the second question is easier than to the first; there is no compelling motive for adopting the singular suffix of a very small and less reliable textual tradition in face of an otherwise strong textual reading which is not out of place.²⁰⁴

It is difficult to answer the first question. The position adopted above regarding "glory" in Hos 4:7,²⁰⁵ and its interpretation in the light of the many parallels in the sense of glory as a human quality ultimately deriving from the divine Glory, could be accepted as the meaning of glory in these two verses also; they have preferred idols instead of the glory of their position as a chosen people.²⁰⁶ One could then argue that to consider these expressions as referring first and foremost to the glory of the LORD as an expression of the mysterious divine Being would be more characteristic of the later period, the last two centuries, B.C., onwards. One need only think of the innumerable times the Targums speak simply of God, in order to realise that the reverse process would also be possible, i.e., to see the "glory of God" in glory. The targumic reading would then be under-

204 All the more so, since the retention of the plural suffix of the MT does not contradict this exegetical tradition (their glory = the glory of their LORD, Targum), whereas to advocate the reverse process (his glory changed to their glory) would be adopting the problematic of the tiqqunim traditions.

205 See above, pp.99-100.

206 Midrash Shir ha-Shirim I,6,3, in citing Ps 106:20, would seem to support this interpretation: "So, because the other nations taunt Israel, saying, This nation degraded itself, as it says, 'They exchanged their glory for an ox that eats grass', Israel, say to them: 'If we, who only sinned once, are to be punished thus, how much more so you'." But then, in I,2,3 of the same Midrash, which also cites this verse of the psalm, glory is very definitely divine glory: "It was manifest to the Holy One, Blessed be He, that Israel would subsequently exchange its Glory for another as it says ... (Ps 106:20). Therefore, he left them no excuse for saying, If He had shown us His Glory and His Greatness, we would have believed in him..."

The contexts of six other midrashic citations of Ps 106:20 are not specific enough as regards glory to permit comment. The MT is cited throughout.

stood in this light and also as a typical example of its tendency to interpret in translating. Very close to the Targum is St. Paul's paraphrase in Rom 1:23. In this way, these verses would have eventually developed into fully-fledged kinnuyim in circles which respected the text, while in more popular circles, the text of Ps 106:20 underwent change, to conform more explicitly with the current interpretation. The ultimate stage in this evolution would have been the systematisation of the traditional tiqqunim lists as represented by the medieval traditions. They would have found no difficulty in deciding what the original was, and in including Hos 4:7.

But, on the other hand, it was not at all impossible that the original interpretation of "glory" in both of these verses is that of divine glory. Especially in view of the parallelism: exchanging their glory, i.e., the One who is their glory, for an idol. The heinousness of idolatry consisted precisely in the substitution of an idol for the invisible God, who dwells in inaccessible light and glory. To describe apostasy in terms of exchanging their Glory for an idol would be but a poetic euphemism.²⁰⁷ Verse 13 of Jer 2 strengthens the interpretation of 2:11 along these lines:

For my people have committed two evils:
They have forsaken me,
The fountain of living water
And hewed out cisterns for themselves ...

Most modern commentators and translations interpret both Jer 2:11²⁰⁸ and Ps 106:20²⁰⁹ in this sense. In addition, the adoption of this line of interpretation coincides with the exegetical traditions underlying the Targum, Rom 1:23 and the LXX variants, so that the euphemistic or metonymic quality of these verses would not be due to later "eisegesis" as outlined in the

207 It has already been noted that Ibn Ezra in his commentary refers to Ps 106:20 in terms of a kinnuy. See above, n.200 and see further below, on the use of this term, pp.169ff.

208 Cf. F. Giesebrecht, Jeremia, (HK), Göttingen 1894, p.8; C.H. Cornill, Das Buch Jeremia, Leipzig 1905, p.19; F. Nötscher, Das Buch Jeremias, (HSAT), Bonn 1934, p.39; W. Rudolph, Jeremia, (HAT), Tübingen 1968 (2nd ed.), p.14; A. Weiser, Jeremia, (ATD), Göttingen 1952, p.18; J. Bright, Jeremiah, (AB), New York 1965, p.11.

209 Cf. J. Olshausen, Die Psalmen, Leipzig 1853, p.410; F. Baethgen, Die Psalmen, (HK), Göttingen 1897, Vol. 2, p.317; B. Duhm, Die Psalmen, (KHC), Freiburg im B. 1899, p.248; C. Briggs, Psalms, (ICC), Edinburgh 1909, Vol. 2, p.340; H. Schmidt, Die Psalmen, (HAT), Tübingen 1934, pp.193-95; H. Herkenne, Das Buch der Psalmen, (HSAT), Bonn 1936, p.347; M. Dahood, Psalms Vol.3, New York 1970, p.64; H.-J. Kraus, Psalms, Neukirchen 1978 (5th ed.), p.903.

preceding paragraphs, but would have been an essential part of their original meaning.

However, irrespective of whichever position one takes as to when these phrases were interpreted with euphemistic overtones, the important point for the present purpose remains clear: namely, that at a later period of textual transmission they were very definitely interpreted as referring to the glory of the LORD. This may be sufficient to explain their presence in the Siphre-Mekhilta list of kinuuyim and ultimately in the medieval tiqqunim lists, complete with "original" readings.

One may therefore conclude that none of these three verses contains a genuine scribal emendation. Jer 2:11 and Ps 106:20 may possibly be considered as euphemistically referring to God, but there is no need to postulate any textual form other than the MT. Hos 4:7 enters this scene as an afterthought, on account of its parallel terminology.

(h) Habakkuk 1:12

הלוא אתה מקדם יהוה אלהי קדשי לא נמות

Verse 12 of the first chapter in Habakkuk may either be considered as opening a second complaint of the prophet addressed to Yahweh, or as resuming the initial complaint (vv.1-4), which had been interrupted by an intervening "response of Yahweh" (vv.5-11). Traditional rabbinic sources²¹⁰ record that the phrase, "We shall not die" is not original, but is a tiqqun. For the original unemended form, the Tanḥuma²¹¹ proposes לֹא יָמוּת, "He does not die", while the other sources attesting original readings agree that it was לֹא תָמוּת, "Thou dost not die",²¹² thereby presupposing that the need for correction was due to a rather crude expression of God's eternity, "Thou dost not die".

Of the textual witnesses, the LXX, Vulgate and Arabic reproduce the MT, with no relevant variants.²¹³ The targumic paraphrase, מִיִּמְרָךְ קִיִּם לְעֵלְמִין,

210 Hab 1:12 is very strongly present in all the sources examined in Ch. 2 above. It is missing only from the list appended to Ma'ase Ephod and from Pugio Fidei, fol.548.

211 All three editions of the Tanḥuma and MS Neubauer 2491 attest "He does not die"; MS Vat. Ebr. 44 gives the MT, and Hab 1:12 is missing from the remaining MSS; see above, p.57.

212 Cf. al-Qirqisani, the Diqduqe and Okhlah lists, Ginsburg no.206, Pugio Fidei, foll. 243, 222, and Radaq.

213 Kennicott notes the usual two MSS; see above, p.62, n.12.

which might possibly be argued to presuppose an original לֹא תָמוּת, "Thou dost not die", is a tempting bait to those seeking to uphold the original reading as proposed by the above listed sources,²¹⁴ while it is probably coincidental that the variant tradition represented by the Syriac could be interpreted as saying the same thing as the Targum in another way.²¹⁵

Furthermore, argumentation on the basis of parallelism²¹⁶ can help to corroborate the view that the MT is not the original one, and may be thus added to the evidence in favour of accepting the authenticity of the tigqunim tradition, together with its alternative reading presupposed by the targumic paraphrase and proposed by the above listed rabbinic sources. However, the weakest point in this argumentation is to cite the targumic paraphrase as upholding the "original" reading proposed by rabbinic traditions. The close relationship between the targums and rabbinic traditions would not necessarily make of the former an independent witness.²¹⁷ Its strongest point might be considered to lie in the striking parallelism resulting from the restoration of the proposed original:

Are you not from ancient times, Yahweh,
My God, my Holy One, who never dies?

But it is precisely this striking parallelism which may be used to argue in favour of the opposite position, namely, that there is no authentic correction here, but a false tradition was built up through misunderstanding "we will not die", and encouraged by the idea contained in the first part

214 Cf. Geiger, op. cit., p.314; Ginsburg, Introduction, p.358; W. Ward, Habakkuk, (ICC), Edinburgh 1912, p.12, who unreservedly swallow the bait. Other commentators who accept the tigqun tradition for Hab 1:12 include F. Hitzig, op. cit., p.256; K. Elliger, op. cit., p.33; T.H. Robinson and F. Horst, op. cit., p.174; C. Keller, Habacuc, Neuchâtel 1971, p.152; W. Rudolph, op. cit., p.208-9.

215 "Thou art not subject to any law" and "Thy word endures forever", both paraphrasing "Thou dost not die".

216 Cf. Ginsburg, Introduction, p.358: "The parallelism plainly shows that this is the correct reading. The address in both clauses is to the Lord who is described in the first clause as never dying or enduring forever. The introduction, therefore, of a new subject in the plural with the predicate "We shall not die", thus ascribing immortality to the people is contrary to the scope of the passage." Cf. also W. Ward, op. cit., p.11.

217 Cf. J. D. Michaelis, Orientalische und Exegetische Bibliothek, Frankfurt am Main 1785, Vol.20, pp. 198ff., who is sceptical of the value of the targumic reading as a textual witness for an original "Thou dost not die".

of the verse.²¹⁸ The silence of the more important textual sources as to any reading other than that of the MT is a decisive point for those who would hold this position.

But before weighing up the arguments for and against these mutually exclusive positions, with a view to determining the original text of Hab 1:12, a third possibility should be mentioned. Van Hoonacker²¹⁹ proposes *לֹא תִּחְיֶה*, "Thou dost not kill" as the original reading. This solution results from his interpretation of v.12²²⁰ and has no textual support in its favour.

An examination of the context of v.12 and of the general movement of Ch.1 will help to focus the claims of the three positions in their various perspectives and prepare the ground for an eventual decision, or at least provide indications pointing to the direction in which the solution may lie.

There is great variety among commentators as to how to interpret the third person suffixes in v.12b. Do they refer to the Chaldeans or to Israel? There is general agreement that Ch. 1 falls into three divisions, vv.2-4, vv.5-11 and vv.12-17, but not all agree as to how to place these sections and as to whether vv.2-4 and vv.12-17 are to be considered as two separate complaints or laments about two different types of oppressions,²²¹ or whether vv.5-11 really interrupt what would be one complaint of the prophet.²²² Arguments drawn from a comparison of terms used in vv.4 and 13 favour the latter interpretation, which in turn helps to interpret v.12. In vv.2-4 the prophet is complaining about the tyranny, injustice and violence that his people are undergoing due to the oppression of the tyrant. In v.12 he expresses his deep belief, that despite the present oppression, Yahweh will not abandon his people.²²³

218 Commentators who do not accept the *tiqqun* for Hab 1:12 include W. Nowack, *op. cit.*, p.409; K. Marti, *op. cit.*, p.335; W. Barnes, *op. cit.*, p.409; A. Ehrlich, *op. cit.*, Vol.5 p.301.

219 *Op. cit.*, p.467f. He is followed by H. Junker, *op. cit.*, p.37 and p.45.

220 Cf. pp. 470-71, cited below in n.227. Junker does not adopt this interpretation, which renders his choice of "Thou dost not kill" even more arbitrary than that of van Hoonacker.

221 Cf. W. Ward, *op. cit.*, pp.8 and 11.

222 Cf. W. Nowack, *op. cit.*, p.252 and p.256; van Hoonacker, *op. cit.*, p.467; Junker, *op. cit.*, p.45

223 Jerome's commentary on Habakkuk 1:12 (*op. cit.*, Vol. 6, p.600) follows

But if the general lines of Ch. 1 are relatively clear, and if v.12 may be understood as Israel's belief in Yahweh's fidelity despite the present calamities, the interpretation of v.12b remains ambiguous. For, on the one hand, this cry of belief may be acceptance of Yahweh's mysterious plans, in which the Chaldean scourge has a positive purifying value. Hab 1:6 supports this interpretation.²²⁴ W. Eichrodt cites this verse of Habakkuk as illustrating how

The whole of history, with its violent variations of fortune, acquired a unified meaning. All its events, above all those which were disastrous and destructive had to be pressed into the service of divine purposes. From being isolated expressions of God's anger, they now become means of educating the covenant people... fitting into a great, universal plan, in accordance with which the Lord of history was accomplishing his salvation.²²⁵

In this case, the third person suffixes refer obviously to the Chaldeans, instruments of Yahweh's justice.

On the other hand, it may be argued that the suffixes refer to Israel, whose mission it is "to bring justice to the nations"²²⁶ Verse 12a would then be seen as reaffirming belief in Yahweh's unchanging fidelity to his plans for Israel, despite the present disasters. The task of deciding which of the three aforementioned "original" readings best fits v.12a becomes more complex in the light of this twofold possibility of interpreting the suffixes in v.12b.

Van Hoonacker's proposed original, "Thou dost not kill", is so closely linked to his interpretation of v.12b²²⁷ that if the balance could

this line: "Quantum autem ad misericordiam tuam, tuum est omne quod vivimus, quod non ab eo interfecti sumus, et ad mortis opera perducti." Cf. Marti, op. cit., p.341.

224 Likewise other biblical passages such as Amos 3:11; Is 10: 5-27; 44:27 45:1; Jer 5:14-19; 25:1-13.

225 Theology of the Old Testament, London 1967, Vol. 2, p.356.

226 Cf. Is 42:1,4; 43:21; 51:4; Mic 4:2-3.

227 "C'est הִפְחִיל à la forme hiphil que le texte primitif aura porté; le complément de הִפְחִיל était exposé dans les deux incisives suivantes, à comprendre comme relatives elliptiques se rapportant à Israel: 'tu ne feras point mourir, Jahvé, celui que tu as établi pour le droit et que sur le roc tu as fondé pour exercer la justice'. C'est le juste (=Israel) qui a été établi sur un fondement inébranable; cf. Prov 10:25... La construction elliptique se régularise (cf. Kautzsch: Gesenius' Hebräische Grammatik, 155,3). ... le sens va bien au

be weighed in favour of the other alternative interpretation of v.12b²²⁸ i.e., that the suffix refers to the Chaldeans, his position would have very little to recommend itself. In addition, there is no textual support for this reading. The juxtaposition of the resulting phrases:

You are from eternity ...
You do not kill ...

does not have any parallel, and is, to say the least, extremely bald and unpoetic. Rather, the many poetic passages and psalms which stress the eternal and stable qualities characteristic of Yahweh's activity usually do so in contrast to the transitory and fragile nature of man,²²⁹ and very often do this in order to evoke either a compelling motive for Yahweh's speedy intervention,²³⁰ or grounds for confidence that, in virtue of his divine wisdom, he will rectify things.²³¹

Finally, the temptation to understand the peshet on Habakkuk 1:12 of the Qumran commentary:²³² "Interpreted, this saying means that God will not destroy his people by the hands of the nations", as witnessing to an original "Thou dost not kill", must be avoided. For this interpretation of Qumran may just as easily rest on the traditional MT, "We will not die", since, in the context, the impending annihilation of Israel would have been inflicted by the nations acting as instruments of the divine Will.²³³ In any event, it would be hazardous to take the interpretation of a peshet of the Qumran sect as founding a reading nowhere else attested. All the more so, when this interpretation can be reconciled with the traditional text without any difficulty.

Eliminating thus the chances of "Thou dost not kill" of being the

contexte: est-il possible que Jahvé laisse périr son peuple, victime des conquérants païens, alors qu'il l'avait destiné à être le juge et l'arbitre des nations?." (op cit., p.471).

228 See n.224 above and n.233 below.

229 Cf. Ps 102:25, 27-28; Lam 5:19; Is 40:8; 57:15.

230 Cf. Lam 5:1-22.

231 Cf. Ps 6:1-10; 9:7-10; 30:1.

232 The commentary on Habakkuk contains only half of the biblical verse; the first part with the alleged tiqqun at the end of col. IV is destroyed; cf. ed. M. Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, Vol. 1, New Haven 1950, Plate LVIII, col. 5,1-5.

233 Cf. the references given above in n.224, and the observation of Eichrodt, n.225. This is also Ibn Ezra's interpretation in his commentary in loco.

original reading, the choice is now narrowed to "We will not die" (MT) and "Thou dost not die" (tiqqunim traditions). One might almost be obliged to opt for a genuine tiqqun here where perfect symmetry and parallelism is obtained by reading:

Are you not from ancient times, Yahweh,
My God, my Holy One, who never dies?

were it not for the following considerations, which provide a number of reasons in favour of the traditional MT, and thereby eliminate the plausibility of "Thou dost not die" as being the original text.

Vv.2-4 and 12-17 are laments of the prophet occasioned by the distressing situation of oppression and tyranny, collective laments in which the prophet is the spokesman of his people. This lament form is commonest in the Psalter, but is not confined to it.²³⁴ This form may be recognised here in vv.12 and following, by the initial invocation to Yahweh in terms of majesty and holiness. The aim of these epithets of praise and grandeur is to underline the misery of the people and thus provoke a divine intervention, or recall motives for having confidence that, in spite of appearances, Yahweh knows what he is doing. Typical of collective laments is the frequent alternation between first person singular and plural,²³⁵ so that the sudden change here in v.12 from singular to plural is more the rule than the exception for this literary form. This change, therefore, need not be invoked as a motive for changing the text.²³⁶ Having addressed Yahweh in terms which recall his enduring fidelity, the prophet expresses the hope and confidence of his people, "We will not die". To reject this reading on the grounds of "ascribing immortality to the people" which "is beyond the scope of this passage"²³⁷ is meaningless, since "we shall not die" in a context of imminent danger means first and foremost "we shall not be annihilated, hic et nunc!" And while it is true that the text certainly does not refer to "immortality" in a philosophical sense, there is no reason for refusing all "immortal" implications;²³⁸ for was it not at such moments

234 Cf. H. Gunkel, Einleitung in die Psalmen, Göttingen 1933, pp.123-24, 134. Cf. 1 Kings 8:23, Is 37:16; Jer 14; etc. His position with regard to the lament form of Hab 1:2-4, 12-17 is accepted and developed by P. Humbert, Problèmes du Livre d'Habakkuk, Neuchâtel 1944, pp.13-14.

235 Cf. Humbert, op. cit., p.13.

236 Cf. Ginsburg, quoted above in n.216.

237 Ibid.

238 "Immortal" as understood within the gradual development present in the OT.

of near-despair and darkness that Israel first dared to hope that death, or confinement to Sheol, was not the end?²³⁹

Continuing the movement of v.12 and the hope of deliverance expressed in "We shall not die", the second part of the verse explains how this deliverance will be possible. Yahweh is using the Chaldeans as a purifying instrument.²⁴⁰ Their power of destruction is not absolute, but temporary in accordance with the divine Will (Hab 1:5-6). While this interpretation of the third person suffixes in 12b would seem better suited to the context, an interpretation of the suffixes as referring to Israel, the nation insured against annihilation, "firm as a rock", would also be possible. To read "Thou dost not die" would break the movement between the first and second parts of the verse; it would at the same time, rob the lament of one of its intrinsic elements.

Finally, it may be argued that the targumic paraphrase, "Your word endures forever", is sufficiently broad to be as much the interpretation of "We shall not die" as of "Thou dost not die". The only remaining argument in favour of the tiqqun "original", namely, symmetry and parallelism, could now be seen as suspect because of its very plausibility, and the fact that a chance corruption could give birth to a fully coherent tiqqun tradition.²⁴¹ It would seem therefore more prudent, due to lack of convincing textual evidence, to retain the MT, and to include Hab 1:12 among the growing list of "false corrections".

(i) Malachi 1:12 and 1:13

(a) Mal 1:12 ואתם מחללים אותי

(b) Mal 1:13 והפחתם אותי

These two verses of the first chapter of Malachi provide an excellent illustration of how the Masoretic lists, while keeping a relatively stable framework of eighteen emendations, could differ in the passages chosen to fit into this framework.²⁴² While Mal 1:13 enjoys a well-established reputation as a tiqqun, figuring among the Mekhilta cases as well as in the bulk of sources for the tiqqunim traditions,²⁴³ Mal 1:12, on the contrary,

239 Cf. Ps 16:10; 30:3; 49:15; 73:24; Job 19:25-26; Ez 37.

240 See above, nn. 224 and 233.

241 At an early date, since Hab 1:12 figures among the Siphre-Mekhilta lists.

242 See above, pp.42-50 and p.55.

would seem to make its first appearance as a tiqqun in a small number of extant Masoretic lists,²⁴⁴ and that alongside Mal 1:13. It would seem then that Mal 1:12 was a late arrival in the family of scribal corrections, an adopted member which was not universally recognised, but given a meagre existence in a few Masoretic lists through similarity and proximity to Mal 1:13. Strictly speaking then, Mal 1:12 should not be investigated here among the more characteristic tiqqunim, as though it possessed the same status.²⁴⁵

(a) Mal 1:12. Closer examination confirms the impression that Mal 1:12 is but a poor relation. Apart from the scarcity of references to it in the lists, and the lack of comment on it by the medieval commentators, consideration of textual evidence likewise produces a negative result. There are no notable variants in any of the early Versions,²⁴⁶ while the Hebrew variants recorded by Kennicott and de Rossi²⁴⁷ can hardly be adduced as sufficient evidence for emending a text which, in any event, best fits the context. Verse 11 describes how Yahweh's name (mentioned three times in this verse) is honoured among the nations. By contrast, in v.12, it is profaned by his priests through their lack of concern for liturgical rubrics. While it is true that Yahweh's name is the equivalent of his person, and that when his priests profane his name²⁴⁸ they are insulting him personally, yet this is not sufficient reason for interpreting the third person singular suffix in v.12 as referring directly to Yahweh, and as ultimately being the emended form of an original first person suffix. It was probably this kind of reasoning²⁴⁹ and, above all, proximity to the well-established tiqqun in the following verse that prompted a certain number of compilers of Masoretic lists to include Mal 1:12.²⁵⁰

243 Mal 1:13 is only lacking in the Siphre and the lists which cite the Siphre, as well as Pugio Fidei, foll.243 and 548.

244 The list appended to the Diqduqe, the lists in Codex Babylonicus, Ginsburg no. 204, BM 1425, BM 21,161 and the Paris MS.

245 See above, p.17, n.3 and see below, nn.251-252.

246 The אֱלֹהִים of the LXX MS 68 can hardly be considered relevant.

247 אֱלֹהִים/אֱלֹהִים: 109; 196; primo 125; videtur 96 (MSS of the 12th-13th cc.).

248 This theme is common in Lev and Ez, both typical expressions of the priestly code and circles. Cf. Lev 18:21; 20:3; 21:2,6; 23:32; Ez 20:39; 36:20,23; 39:7. See also Amos 2:7; Jer 34:16. See below, pp.206ff. à propos of Is 48:11.

249 Perhaps valid to a certain extent in preaching, but not in textual study.

250 Mal 3:8,9 is also listed in Codex Babylonicus and Ginsburg no. 204.

Commentators find no difficulty in interpreting the verse according to the MT and the same is true of modern translations. It is therefore all the more surprising to find that O. Procksch, in editing the Minor Prophets in BHK (3rd ed.), labelled Mal 1:12 as a tiqqun²⁵¹ and considered that the original of rabbinic sources should be adopted. His decision was apparently based uniquely on the authority of tiqqunim traditions in general, and since he did not regard Mal 1:13 as a tiqqun, it would seem that he was unaware that Mal 1:12 had only been relatively recently adopted into the family of tiqqunim.²⁵²

(b) Mal 1:13. That this verse is a tiqqun is recorded by many of the sources within the traditions.²⁵³ That the tradition is an old one is shown by its presence among the kinnuyim of the Mekhilta list, and by the fact that Jerome in his commentary on Mal 1:13²⁵⁴ would seem to have been aware of this tradition. Rashi cites it as being "One of the eighteen scribal corrections" and provides the "original" reading: "You sniff at me"²⁵⁵ in place of the MT, "You sniff at it" (presumably the offering or sacrifice which is considered polluted).

Textual evidence is varied. The Targum and Vulgate reproduce the MT. The vast majority of LXX MSS, followed by the Syriac and Arabic, read a first person singular verb, ἐξέφυσῃσα.²⁵⁶ The Arabic then follows the LXX tradition in reading a plural object, αὐτῶ, while the Syriac agrees with the MT, Vulgate and Targum, in reading a singular object, אִתּוֹ. Ziegler's option for the verbal reading attested by Sinaiticus, etc., thereby considering the bulk of the LXX tradition to have been influenced by the

251 Cf. BHK, p.973.

252 His source was probably one of the Masoretic lists where Mal 1:12 was listed before 1:13 (no list studied above attests Mal 1:12 without 1:13 either immediately before or after it). E. Würthwein, op. cit., (2nd ed.), p.20, in giving the official list of eighteen, likewise mentions Mal 1:12 at the expense of 1:13, but in his most recent edition (4th, 1973) he lists 1:13 in place of 1:12. BHS (K. Elliger) had transferred the siglum from 1:12 to 1:13 before him. See above, p.17.

253 See above, p.55 for details.

254 Cf. op. cit., Vol. 6, Part I, p.953; see below, n.260, for the text.

255 This original reading is likewise supplied by the Tanhuma, al-Qirqisani, the Diqduqe and Okhlah lists, Ginsburg no.204, BM 1425 and Pugio Fidei fol.222.

256 J. Ziegler, Septuaginta XII. Duodecim Prophetæ, Göttingen 1943, p.330, cites Sinaiticus, 130¹-239 and Jerome only as recording the MT plural form of the verb.

textual form of Hag 1:9,²⁵⁷ seems to be well founded. In any event, this difference between singular and plural verbs cannot be connected with the motives underlying scribal corrections, for even if the LXX singular reading were the original one, there would be no great disrespect involved (cf. Hag 1:9). While there is variation between the third person singular object, אִתּוֹ, of the MT, and the third person plural object of the LXX,²⁵⁸ nowhere in the Versions is the proposed first person singular "original" reading, אִתִּי, to be found - the reading which alone could give scandal. In fact, apart from the above mentioned rabbinic traditions, this singular reading is found only in the usual MSS of Kennicott²⁵⁹ and in Jerome's commentary on Malachi.

In the course of his exposition of this verse,²⁶⁰ which, in both Vulgate and commentary, is rendered as close to the MT as any translation permits, Jerome would seem to be exploiting rabbinic traditions. His manner of citing these traditions could be misleading, "Sive ut in Hebraeo legi potest: et exsufflastis me",²⁶¹ were it not for the fact that Jerome does not change his text here or in the Vulgate to suit these Jewish traditions.²⁶² That he had access to other Jewish traditions concerning different readings is evidenced by his knowledge of the midrashic list of passages of the Torah which were modified in the translation for King Ptolemy.²⁶³ It would be prudent, therefore, not to cite Jerome's commentary on Malachi as recording the original Hebrew text.

Analysis of the context alone of Mal 1:13 does not really provide any convincing arguments against either reading being the original. In the

257 καὶ ἐξεφύσησα αὐτόν, with Yahweh as subject.

258 Which might likewise be accounted for as having been influenced by Hag 1:9.

259 See above, p.62, n.12.

260 "'Ecce de labore, exsufflastis illud, dicit Dominus exercituum'. Cujus orationis hic sensus est: Dixistis, de captivitate reversi sumus, hostibus praedae fuimus ... qualiaquumque habemus, offerimus; et haec dicendo exsufflastis vestra sacrificia, id est, exsufflatione mea digna fecistis: sive ut in Hebraeo legi potest: Et exsufflastis me haec dicendo: non sacrificio, sed mihi cui sacrificabatis, fecistis injuriam. Quamobrem nequaquam suscipiam illud de manu vestra, dicit Dominus omnipotens ..." (p.953). See above, n.254.

261 Cf. Ginsburg, *op. cit.*, p.359; H. Mitchell, *op. cit.*, p.44. Both consider that Jerome is referring to the original Hebrew text.

262 Jerome would have made a more positive effort to restore this reading in the Vulgate, if he had considered it to be the "Veritas Hebraica".

263 Cf. Excursus, pp.131ff., below.

passage 1:6 - 2:9, Yahweh, addressing the priests in the first person singular, upbraids them severely for their laxity and nonchalance with regard to their religious duties. Part of this indifference consists in their contemptuous attitude towards altar and sacrifice, "What a weariness it is! ... and sniff at me", does not upset the sequence of thought; it spells it out more clearly. In sniffing disdainfully at the sacrificial offerings they are insulting Yahweh, for whom these offerings are destined. Perhaps it was just such an interpretation and search for the deeper implications of the biblical verse in later exegetical circles that eventually gave birth to this tiqqun. Jerome's train of thought in his commentary seems to confirm this.

In view of these considerations and the absence of any convincing textual evidence in favour of the rabbinic reading,²⁶⁴ it seems best to include Mal 1:13 among those false corrections which belong to the sphere of exegesis and homiletic exposition rather than to consider it as reflecting a genuine tiqqun, with repercussions in the field of textual criticism. Modern writers and commentators do not share this conclusion uniformly. Most of them²⁶⁵ accept the tiqqun and incorporate it into their text. In general this is true too of modern translations,²⁶⁶ although it is interesting to note that the NEB, which accepts many of the other false tiqqunim, resists the temptation here!

(j) Job 32:3

ובשלת רעיו חרה אפו על אשר לא מצאו מענה וירשיעו את איוב

Job 32:3 tells of the youth Elihu's wrath because the three friends have "found no answer, and have declared Job to be in the wrong". This verse figures as a tiqqun from the Tanḥuma lists onwards.²⁶⁷ The original

264 It might be more rewarding to examine the different readings of the MT and LXX for Mal 1:7, "How have we polluted thee/it?".

265 Cf. F. Hitzig, op. cit., p.400; W. Nowack, op. cit., p.431; K. Marti, op. cit., p.465; A. Geiger, op. cit., p.313; C. Ginsburg, op. cit., p.359; H. Mitchell, op. cit., p.206; H. Junker, op. cit., p.206; T.H. Robinson, op. cit., p.264; K. Elliger, op. cit., 183; W. Rudolph, op. cit., p.258.

266 Cf. RSV; J; L; Dhorme; Osty.

267 It is attested in all the lists subsequent to the Tanḥuma which are listed on p.55 above, the only exception being naturally, the Siphre list in Pugio Fidei, fol.669.

reading is given in the form of various paraphrases for the divine name in those lists which provide "original" readings,²⁶⁸ as יי אה, "Yahweh" in al-Qirqisani, and אה אלהים, "God", in the three lists in Pugio Fidei.²⁶⁹ Thus, in keeping with the essential motivation regarding scribal corrections, the "original" blasphemous expression, "They declared God/Yahweh to be in the wrong" was supposedly emended to "They declared Job to be in the wrong". Ibn Ezra, in his commentary in loco, though he refers to the tradition of tiqqune sopherim, does not seem to care for the proposed "original" reading²⁷⁰ and his commentary presupposes the MT.

None of the Versions indicates the slightest suggestion of this proposed original; rather they all reflect a Vorlage in keeping with the MT. That the present MT involves some difficulty in interpretation may be observed not only by the fact that the Versions differ in their interpretation of the MT,²⁷¹ but also because almost all the modern commentators consulted follow the correction²⁷² proposed by rabbinical traditions despite the absence of any evidence in the Versions.²⁷³ For the present form of the MT would seem to be inconsistent: in v.1 the three friends cease to answer Job "Because he is righteous in his own eyes"; in v.3, Elihu is very angry with them because they have ceased to answer Job, or literally, "They found

268 Cf. the list appended to the Diqduqe, the Okhlah list, BM 1425, Ginsburg no.206 and also Rashi.

269 Foll. 222, 243 and 548.

270 "It is written that this is a tiqqun sopherim; those who say this know of something which is hidden from me."

271 See below, n.283 and n.284 .

272 Cf. B. Duhm, op. cit., p.153; A. Geiger, op. cit., p.332; A.Ehrlich, op. cit., Vol. 6, p.307; P.Dhorme, op. cit., pp.431-32; N. Peters, op. cit., pp.357-58; P. Szczygiel, op. cit., p.168; G.Hölscher, op. cit., p.78; G. Fohrer, op. cit., p.446; S. Terrien, op. cit., p.215; M. Pope, op. cit., pp.210-12; R. Gordis, op. cit., pp.366-67; many of these refer back to the tiqqun in Job 7:20, which they have already accepted. The following commentators do not accept the proposed correction: F. Delitzsch, op. cit., p.427; A. Weiser, op. cit., p.217; K. Budde, op. cit., p.188; S. R. Driver - G. B. Gray, op. cit., part I, p.278; part II, p.232; A. Blommerde, Northwest Semitic Grammar and Job, (OB, no.22), Rome 1969, p.117; of these five, the last three do not accept Job 7:20 either. Cf. also the position of the HOTTP Committee, Vol.3, p.105, which retains the MT.

273 A number of commentators also follow the reading proposed by some of the Versions, etc. (LXX, Symmachus, Syriac, Syro-hexaplar (mg), 1 MS of Kennicott, no.248) for v.1: the three men cease to answer Job because he is righteous in their eyes. (Geiger, Dhorme, Peters, Szczygiel).

no answer 'and' they condemned him" - this is how the LXX and Targum translate the relationship between the two verbs.²⁷⁴ If, in v.1, the reason for the cessation of the friends' refutation is because Job is righteous "in his own eyes", it is rather strange, though not impossible, that in v.3 they found no answer and (therefore?) declared Job to be in the wrong.

Rabbinic traditions and the modern commentators are not the only ones who found the verse difficult to understand. Within the LXX tradition, which for v.3 runs: καὶ ἔθεντο αὐτὸν εἶναι ἄσεβῃ, a few variants propose εὐσεβῇ,²⁷⁵ which would then agree more logically with v.1 in its LXX form: ἦν γὰρ Ἰωβ δίκαιος ἐναντίον αὐτῶν,²⁷⁶ fitting the context beautifully, for Elihu angrily takes up the refutation of Job's innocence, now that the three have failed and have declared him righteous. This last point is a clearcut example of a correction intended to smooth out apparent or real contradictions or difficulties. It is hoped that, on closer examination of the context of Job 32:1 ff., together with examination of the translations of the Syriac and Vulgate, and in the absence of textual support from the Versions, it can be shown that the proposed original of rabbinic traditions is nothing other than this same desire to smooth out apparent or real contradictions or difficulties, but at a later stage in the transmission of the text and in a different climate of thought.

The speeches of Elihu mark a new phase in the structure of the book of Job. Without going into details as to whether the speeches are a later insertion, or whether they formed an authentic part of the original composition,²⁷⁷ it is sufficient to note that the modern commentators remark

274 Their rendering leaves the relationship between the two verbs open to a number of possible interpretations (see also below, n.283 and n.284 concerning Vulgate and Syriac renderings).

275 Syro-hexaplar (mg); Cod. 23 of Holmes-Parsons; Cod. Alex^a (a = prima m.); Sinaiticus^c.

276 The correction was facilitated by the similarity in form between ἄσεβῃ and εὐσεβῇ, but the correction cannot be considered valid with such a weight of textual evidence against it, and the principle of lectio difficilior.

277 Cf. N. Peters, *op. cit.*, p.23*, who upholds the integrity of Ch.32-37 in the original composition. He summarises his position as follows: "Die Elihureden, c32-37, werden heute von der grossen Mehrzahl der protestantischen Forscher zwar für spätern Zusatz gehalten, aber von Männern wie Budde, Cornill, Sellin und Wildboer energisch verteidigt". Cf. P. Dhorme, *op. cit.*, p.LXXXII of his Introduction: "La thèse de la postériorité des discours d'Elihou a rencontré la plus grande faveur chez les critiques. ... Non seulement Dillmann, mais encore

on the change of style and transitional character of Job 32:1-5.²⁷⁸ It is precisely this transitional character, the need to explain who Elihu was, why he intervenes, that necessitates the style of these five verses. Without prejudice as to whether chapters 32-37 were included in the original draft of the book or not, the introductory verses of Ch. 32 cannot be said to form part of the original movement of the book in the same way as some of the more carefully articulated speeches, or even in comparison with the simple flow of the prose introduction and conclusion. Rather they give the impression of five rather hurried verses destined to give, as summarily as possible, the bare essentials of what has taken place up to this point, enough to explain the object of Elihu's intervention.²⁷⁹ One of the striking features of this hurried introduction to Elihu's speeches is that, paradoxically, brevity is maintained by repetition. Elihu's wrath is mentioned four times (vv.2a,2b,3,5), Job's consciousness of his righteousness twice (vv.1,2), and the cessation of the friends' argumentation three times (vv.1,3,5). Therefore, all that must be expected of these verses is that they conjure up in a general way what has preceded, in order to explain the wrath and speeches of the young impatient Elihu.

In the case of v.1, some of the Versions²⁸⁰ and modern commentators who accept this evidence, transform "righteous in his eyes" to "righteous in their eyes", probably because this reading would give a far more cogent reason for the termination of the friends' argumentation and a very powerful incentive to the young Elihu's outburst - the idea that the three friends give up because they have been brainwashed into thinking that Job is right. Added to this is the objection to the present MT form, that there was not much point in repeating something which Job had not ceased to affirm.²⁸¹

Klostermann, König, Siegfried, Duhm, Delitzsch, Gray, Peake, Strahan, Ball, Battenweiser et d'autres encore sont partisans d'un livre de Job complété par les discours d'Elihou." Dhorme himself likewise opts for a difference in time and personality between chapters 32-37 and the rest of the book (cf. p.LXXXV).

278 Budde, who holds for the authenticity of Elihu's speeches in the initial draft, nevertheless suppresses 32:2-5 (cf. op. cit., p.186f.) Cf. Dhorme, p.LXXVIII and Gray, p.278.

279 It has been remarked, with varying degrees of insistence, by a number of commentators, that if Ch.s 32-37 were omitted nothing of the essential movement and message of Job would be lost. Cf. Gray, op.cit., p.22, and others.

280 See above, n.273.

But there is no need to accept this change if these five verses are seen to be summarising in order to introduce Elihu. It is rather a case of the preceding Ch.s 29-31, where Job vehemently declares his innocence, especially the very solemn negative confession formula of Ch. 31, being condensed into these few words in 32:1. The Vulgate and Targum support the MT reading, and here again the lectio difficilior would be the MT.²⁸²

Verses 2 and 3 describe Elihu's wrath and the cause of it, first against Job because he is justifying himself at God's expense, and he is angry with the three friends because:

(a) "they found no answer although they had declared Job to be in the wrong", 283

or (b) "they were not able to reply and to declare Job to be in the wrong". 284

In (a) Elihu's anger is directed against the three, not so much for convicting Job without sufficient proof, but because, by their silence and cessation of argumentation, they are indirectly acquiescing to Job's point

281 Cf. Dhorme, op. cit., p.340: "La fin 'parce qu'il était juste à ses yeux' ne donne pas la raison du silence des interlocuteurs de Job. Celui-ci n'a cessé de plaider son innocence et nous savons qu'il s'est toujours considéré comme juste".

282 Cf. Gray, op. cit., Part II, p.252: "...but 'he had become (during the course of the debate) righteous in their eyes' would have required הִיָּה rather than הָיָה; cp. eg. Gen 27:23." See also Fohrer, op. cit., p.446: Terrien, op. cit., p.216 n.2: "...cependant, rien dans la discussion ne permet de faire penser que les amis de Job se soient rendus à cette opinion (i.e. צָדִיק בְּעֵינֵיהֶם). La colère d'Elihou vient au contraire du silence des amis qu'il interpréta dans le sens d'une approbation." Cf. vv.3 and 5.

283 This is the rendering of the RSV, which accepts the interpretation of waw in וַיִּרְשִׁיעַ in the sense adopted by the Vulgate: "Porro adversum amicos ejus indignatus est eo quod non invenissent responsionem rationabilem sed tantummodo condemnassent Job." The LXX αὐτὰ and the Aramaic waw in וַיִּיכֹל may both be interpreted along these lines.

284 This interpretation involves the extension of לֹא to the whole phrase. Cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, Hebräische Grammatik, Leipzig 1896, p.477, 152z: "Nicht selten erstreckt eine Negation ihre Wirkung auch auf einen parallelen zweiten (mit oder ohne Waw angereichten) Verneinungssatz. This rendering has the support of the Syriac Version, where if the second verb were not to be included under the negative particle, it would have been expressed in the perfect form. See Gray, op. cit., p.279, "and against his three friends he was hot with anger because they had found no answer, and had not shown Job to be unrighteous."

of view (vv.3 and 5). In (b) Elihu's anger and intervention are even more understandable, for the three have given up without convicting Job.²⁸⁵

To decide which of these two lines of interpretation is the more faithful to the MT is, in this context, less important than the fact that there are no grounds left upon which to found the interpretation which would substitute God for Job, other than rabbinic traditions available only in later works. These traditions also encountered a certain difficulty in understanding v.3, especially the relationship between the two verbs; and their solution was that the present form covers up an original blasphemous expression. Totally unaware of the methods of literary and form criticism in their verse to verse literal exegesis, and surely aware of the phenomenon of scribal corrections and the theological instinct that motivated them, they were doubtlessly influenced by the preceding verse which ends with אלהים, where Elihu's anger stems from the fact that Job is justifying himself rather than God. So too, in v.3, his anger stems from the fact that the friends' inability to convict Job (total or partial inability, depending on the interpretation adopted) means that they are consequently justifying Job rather than God. It was simply a question of launching this interpretation under the auspices of the accepted traditions concerning tiqqunim, at a time before the official number was stabilised.

(k) Lamentations 3:20

זכור תזכור וחשיח עלי נפשי (וחשור Q)

Chapter three of Lamentations begins on a very low note, describing in detail the speaker's distress and anguish. This atmosphere of conflict and profound depression develops and reaches a climax, which then gives way to a peace and tranquillity somewhat similar to the easy gentle rocking of a boat that has at last reached quiet waters. The strophe in vv.19-21 may be considered as this climax and turning point. The relentless memory of the calamities that have come to pass, the constant mental agony (v.19) that has been increasing and magnifying the distress is suddenly transformed (v.21). Reflection on these very afflictions now becomes a motive for hope in the steadfast love of Yahweh, whose mercies never come to an end (v.22). And so the poem continues.

285 The variant εὐσεβῆ, see above, n.275, might possibly be seen as an attempt to bring the LXX into line with this tradition, but as already mentioned, it is more likely due to the LXX form of v.1.

But the wording in v.20 of this transition presented difficulties for the rabbis. The tiqqunim traditions²⁸⁶ indicate that the scribes emended the "original" reading to the present MT. However, the lists which include "original" readings are by no means unanimous as to what was the "original" reading in this case. Of the Tanḥuma textual traditions only the MS Neubauer 2491 gives a reading, עלך, "upon thee". This same reading is also attested by the list in the Diqude appendix, the Okhlah list, Ginsburg no.206 and the notes accompanying the Minhṭ Shai Bible. A double correction was applied to the "original" reading according to al-Qirqisani and the three lists in Pugio Fidei, עלך נפש, "thy soul (bends down/sinks down) within thee", while the list appended to Ma'ase Ephod in BM 1425 attests נפש, "his soul" as original. According to Ginsburg²⁸⁷ and Geiger²⁸⁸ the original text had נפש, "thy soul".²⁸⁹ Neither Rashi nor Radaq nor Ibn Ezra mention this verse as a tiqqun.

The Versions, while varying in their translation of the Qere/Ketib,²⁹⁰ do not record anything other than the MT first person singular suffix for both words, "my soul ... upon me". This overwhelming textual unanimity, together with the corresponding vagueness and confusion of the varying rabbinic "original" readings mentioned above, augurs badly for this tiqqun's chances of being authentic.

286 From the Tanḥuma onwards, but missing from the Babylonian Codex lists, Ginsburg no.204 and the two lists of "thirteen", the Paris MS and BM Add. 21, 161. Together with Hos 4:7 and 2 Sam 16:12 it shares the distinction of being among the three least attested tiqqunim, totally absent from the early traditions, and only partially attested in Masoretic lists.

287 Cf. Introduction, p.361.

288 Cf. op. cit., p.315. Neither author states the exact source of this reading, which is not attested as such among the original readings listed above, since al-Qirqisani and the Pugio Fidei lists attest a double original, עלך נפש which gives a different nuance from that adopted by Ginsburg and Geiger.

289 T. H. Robinson (BHK and BHS) also follows this partial "original" in the critical apparatus for both editions.

290 תשוח/תשיח. This is a secondary problem not directly concerned with the tiqqunim problem, for rabbinical circles presuppose the Qere. In this instance, in view of the affinity between Ayin Yodh, Ayin Waw and Double Ayin verbs, there is a certain amount of hesitation as to where to classify the verbal form, but practically no doubt as to its meaning in the context: "to sink down, to be weighed down, to bend down" (cf. Gesenius-Buhl, p.827, שיח or שוח; Kähler-Baumgartner, p.965, שיח or שוח; Brown-Driver-Briggs, p.1001, שוח; Mandelkern, p.1157, שוח; W. Rudolph, "Der Text der Klagelieder", ZAW 56 (1938) 111-112.

A glance at the context and the commentators confirms this impression. Continuing the theme of v.19, the following verse describes the effect of this continual anguished reflection. Taking נַפְשִׁי, "my soul", to be subject of both verbs in this verse, the following rendering:

My soul continually thinks of it
And is bowed down within me (RSV)

captures the depths of the depression in which the speaker finds himself. By thus describing in vivid detail the experience of this helplessness, the contrasting hope of v.21, elaborated in the verses which follow, stands out all the more clearly, highlighting the turning point of the lament. This is a movement paralleled in a number of the lament-psalms.²⁹¹ Both LXX and Targum support this translation of the first verb of v.20 as third personal singular, feminine, having נַפְשִׁי as subject, while the Vulgate indirectly confirms this reading.²⁹² Modern studies on Lamentations likewise find no difficulty in adopting this translation where "my soul" is subject of both verbs,²⁹³ and make very little or no mention whatever of the tiq-qunim traditions.

Where then did this idea of a blasphemous expression in need of emendation originate? Especially since this verse is to be found in a strophe in which no reference, direct or indirect, is made to God. Other rabbinic sources may be of help here. In Lamentations Rabbah III, 7, the two midrashic interpretations of this verse both presuppose that זְכוּר-הַזְכוּר of v.20 is addressed to God, "do thou remember" or "thou wilt remember".²⁹⁴ Rashi also interprets the first verb as being second person masculine,

291 Cf. Ps 6; 13; 22; 28; etc.

292 "Memoria memor ero et tabescit in me anima mea." The Syriac and Arabic inaccuracies are of no help here.

293 Cf. the following commentators who retain the MT; M.Lühr, Die Klage lieder des Jeremia, (HK), Göttingen 1893, p.14; K. Budde, Die Klagelieder, (KHC), Tübingen u. Leipzig 1898, p.94; T. Paffrath, Die Klagelieder, Frankfurt am Main 1954, p.36; H. Wiesmann, Die Klagelieder, (ATD), Göttingen 1958, p.69; H.J. Kraus, Klagelieder, (BK), Neukirchen 1960 (3rd. ed. 1968), p.51f.; W. Rudolph, Die Klagelieder, (KAT), Gutersloh 1962, p.228f.; D. Hillers, Lamentations, (AB), New York 1972, p.56. The MT is also retained by the HOTTP Committee, Vol. 4, New York 1979, p.346.

294 The shorter of the two reads as follows: "Rabbi Judan said: 'Do thou remember', I know that thou rememberest the nations of the world, but what am I to do, seeing that my soul is bowed down within me." It is possible that this interpretation of the verb זָכַר is likewise present in the citation of this verse in the Pesiqta Rabbati, par.29(30).

singular,²⁹⁵ but Ibn Ezra would seem to follow the traditional interpretation.²⁹⁶ As already observed, neither of them mentions this verse as being a tiqqun.

With such a rabbinic interpretation of the first part of v.20²⁹⁷ to be found in certain circles, the natural flow of the phrase tends to become disrupted: "Thou wilt remember and my soul is bowed down within me". A further exegetical development may have been to read the second part of the verse as logically evolving from the first, and as being connected with God too: "Thou wilt remember and thy soul sinks down with thee,"²⁹⁸ thereby implying that God too was subject to deep dejection. Such a gross anthropomorphism could not be allowed to remain untouched! This remains but a suggestion as to how Lam 3:20 became a scribal emendation. For, while there is no difficulty in concluding that Lam 3:20 is not in any way a genuine emendation, and that the present MT must be respected,²⁹⁹ the actual moment of its relatively late entry into the official lists cannot be determined due to scarcity of trustworthy material.

(1) Numbers 11:15 and 12:12

(i) Num 11:15

אם מצאתי חן בעיניך ואל אראה ברעתי

Moses, weary and disheartened both by the people's lack of co-operation and by Yahweh's blazing anger, pours out his sorrow to Yahweh:

295 He cites the above mentioned tradition from Lamentations Rabbah in a slightly different form.

296 "When my soul remembers this - the evil, it sinks down within me."

297 As already pointed out, the change from grief and sorrow to hope and confidence does not come until v.21. It was probably under the influence of the note of hope in v.21 that the rabbis began to interpret v.20 likewise. Cf. H. Wiesmann, *op. cit.*, pp.179-180.

298 This is the "original" reading proposed by al-Qirqisani and the three lists in Pugio Fidei. The other proposed "original" of rabbinic provenance, "my soul bows down upon thee", although containing a daring anthropomorphic image, is not as bold as a double correction. The "original" as proposed by Ginsburg, Geiger and Robinson (see above, nn. 287-89) "thy soul will bend down unto me" is also less daring as an anthropomorphism.

299 Not so, the NEB. Its paraphrase is difficult to accept:
Remember O Remember
And stoop down to me.

What has gone wrong? Why are you treating me like this? I am not able to bear this burden single-handed, so please, if this is how things are going to continue, kill me right now "that I may not see my wretchedness". This last phrase of Moses' entreaty figures in the early Siphre-Mekhilta lists as a kinnuy and reappears faithfully in the tiqqunim lists.³⁰⁰ The present MT, ברעתי, "on my wretchedness", according to these sources, covers up an "original" reading, ברעתך, "on thy wretchedness/evil."³⁰¹

This "original" reading, however, is not to be found in the Versions.³⁰² Apart from a very firm confirmation of the MT everywhere, noteworthy is the tradition present in the Fragmentum Targum and Neofiti, "that I may not see the wretchedness of your people".³⁰³ This tradition reappears later with Rashi, for in his commentary on Num 11:15, having identified this verse as a tiqqun, he indicates ברעתם, "on their wretchedness"³⁰⁴ as being the original reading. This reading is also recorded by Minhag Shai alongside the remark that Rashi, in his commentary on Job 32:3, gives ברעתך, "on your wretchedness" as the original reading. It would thus seem that there was a certain hesitation as to what the "original" reading was, especially when two readings are proposed by the same person. This in itself arouses suspicion.

But it is even more difficult to see how "their wretchedness" could have been an original reading which needed to be changed to "my evil", to avoid disrespect, blasphemy, etc., It is far more probable that the reverse possibility is nearer the truth, that out of respect for Moses,³⁰⁵ exegetical and homiletic traditions grew up which transferred the "wretchedness" of Moses to the people, for after all it was their fault rather than his, that the divine wrath was aroused. The exegesis of this passage in the

300 It is only absent from the Siphre Zuṭṭa/Midrash Haggadol tradition and BM Add. 21, 161. See above p.55.

301 This "original" reading is present in the following sources: Tanḥuma (MS Neubauer 2491), al-Qirqisani, the list appended to the Diqduq, the Okhlah list, BM 1425, Ginsburg no.206, Yalqut Shime'oni at Num 11:15 and all Pugio Fidei lists.

302 Kennicott lists 1 MS (153, Butzoviens, 13th c.) as attesting ברעתך; apart from MS 300 (see above, p.62 n.12).

303 ולא אחמי בבישחחון דעמך.

304 Kennicott records MS 400 sup. ras. (Geneva 14th c.) as having this reading, in addition to the usual two MSS (see above, p.62 n.12).

305 Cf. Judg 18:30 for a genuine correction which protected Moses. See below pp.225ff.

Siphre on Numbers may possibly spring from the same inspiration. It certainly ends up with the same result, "my wretchedness" becomes "the retribution that is laid up for them".³⁰⁶ It may have been such traditions that earned this verse its place among the kinnuyim of the Siphre and Mekhilta traditions.

Later on, during the process of elaboration and systematisation of the tiggunim lists, it may have been forgotten or ignored in some circles that the earlier exegetical traditions were concerned only with safeguarding Moses' character. Examined now in the perspective of the later tiggunim traditions, this verse was considered to have originally read "thy wretchedness",³⁰⁷ and wherever the other exegetical tradition was drawn upon (cf. Rashi), its reading becomes almost meaningless, if it is to be taken as the original disrespectful form of the now altered text.

Leaving aside these rabbinic traditions,³⁰⁸ there remains no motive whatever for accepting any text other than the MT. There is no reason why Moses cannot, under the present circumstances, be referring to his own wretchedness. This wretched condition, which he wants blotted out by death, is the burden that is too heavy for him in v.14. Ibn Ezra refuses to accept this verse as a correction and considers that the MT contains no difficulty.³⁰⁹ Commentators accept this verse readily as it stands.³¹⁰ They do not even bother to mention the existence of these traditions. Ehrlich³¹¹ dismisses these traditions too, so that there remains only the faithful few³¹² who

306 "... Thus Moses spoke to God: 'Kill me, for it is better for me if you kill me first so that I may not see the retribution that is prepared for them.' (in loco).

307 See above, n.301.

308 They have only the slightest record in the Hebrew MSS tradition, and the Versions. See above, nn.302-304.

309 עוד ברעה שאני בה אין צורך לתקון הסופרים

310 Cf. A. Knobel, Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua, (KeH), Leipzig 1861, p.51; H. Holzinger, Numeri, (KHC), Tübingen u. Leipzig 1903, p.44; B. Baentsch, Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri, (HK), Göttingen 1903, p.507; J.B. Gray, Numbers, (ICC), Edinburgh 1903, p.109; P. Heinisch, Das Buch Numeri, (HSAT), Bonn 1936, p.49; M. Noth, Das vierte Buch Mose, (ATD), Göttingen 1966, p.78. Cf. also the HOTIP decision, Vol. 1, p.225.

311 Op. cit., p.148 (Vol. 1): "Aber hier haben die Rabbinen Unrecht, denn ברעה ist keine euphemistische Umschreibung."

312 Geiger, op. cit., p.332; Ginsburg, op. cit., p.353; cf. C.T. Fritsch, The Anti-Anthropomorphisms of the Greek Pentateuch, Princeton 1943, p.7; W. Rudolph (BHK and BHS).

see here a genuine tiqqun sopherim for the "original" reading, "that I may not see your wretchedness". Num 11:15 must join the ranks of false corrections.

(ii) Num 12:12

אשר בצאתו מרחם אמו ויאכל חצי בשרו

Num 12:9-10 relates how Miriam is struck with leprosy in punishment for the murmuring against Moses for which she and her brother Aaron had been responsible (12:1f.). Aaron beseeches Moses urgently to forgive them both (v.11) and implores him to do something so that "She may not be as one dead, the half of whose flesh is eaten away on coming from its mother's womb" (v.12). The tiqqunim traditions list Num 12:12 as a correction, and it is listed in the Siphre and Mekhilta also.³¹³ The original text, the tiqqunim traditions say,³¹⁴ read: "Let her not be as a still-born child, with the half of our flesh eaten away on coming from our mother's womb"; so that the correction would have consisted in a change from first person plural to third person anonymous in the suffixes for "mother" and "flesh".

Num 12:12 is unusual on two scores. If the correction really took place, this would be the only verse among the official "eighteen" where the scribes were not concerned uniquely with respecting things divine. For if the above "original" reading were to be accepted, the motivation underlying the correction would appear to have been respect for Moses, the shunning of any suggestion of impurity in connection with his origins.³¹⁵ Secondly,

313 Num 12:12 is attested in all the sources examined in Ch. 2 above, with the exception of the lists on foll. 222, 243 and 548 of Pugio Fidei. As already mentioned (see above, p.27, n.10 and p.33, n.39) Num 12:12 contains a double tiqqun if the full verse is cited. In the early traditions it was sometimes fully cited, and sometimes just the first part, "When it comes out of its mother's womb", was cited. It is only in some of the later lists that it is explicitly introduced as two separate cases (cf. BM 1425, where 12:12a appears third in the list and 12:12b appears second last); this explicit subdivision is illustrated on the chart above (p.55) for lists no.s 11 - 16 and no.19.

314 Depending on whether one or both elements in the verse are cited, the following sources attest as original "our mother" and "our flesh": Tanhuma, al-Qirqisani, the Diqduqe and Okhlah lists, BM 1425, Ginsburg no. 206 and the Siphre quotation in R. Martin's Pugio Fidei, fol.669. Rashi also indicates that it is a tiqqun and supplies the same original reading.

315 This fact causes Lieberman some embarrassment; he suggests that this verse should never have entered the tiqqunim lists (op. cit., p.32f.).

both Siphre³¹⁶ and Mekhilta,³¹⁷ contrary to their method of presenting the lists, indicate the sense underlying the substitute expression.

The Versions would not seem to have been aware of this underlying sense or original reading. No variants to this effect are recorded by any of them. While the Targum's paraphrase³¹⁸ can hardly be relevant in the present investigation, the Syriac, ܡܝܪܝܡ ܕܢܗܝ, prompted Geiger to see the scribal emendation as having consisted in a change from ܢܗܝ to ܢܗܝ.³¹⁹ Having stated that

diese alte L.A. ܢܗܝ bezeugt nicht blos die Trad., sondern auch der Syrer, und nicht Minder die starken Umschreibungen der andern Uebers. ...,

he then gives an ingenious explanation of the sense of the correction. "Half of the flesh" would have been inaccurate if it were only Miriam who had been compared to the "dead child". Originally Aaron had included himself in the request he made to Moses, identifying himself with his sister's flesh. The above quoted statement of Geiger is inaccurate. Both tiqqunim and kinnuyim sources are unanimous in indicating that the original reading was "our flesh" and "our mother". They make no mention of a change of verbal form. And the rendering of this verse in the Versions other than the Targum can hardly be termed "starke Umschreibungen". Instead, they present reasonably faithful translations of the MT. The targumic paraphrase cannot be related to the Syriac rendering. Only the Syriac verb remains to support Geiger's position, a reading which has no compelling motive to favour its authenticity.³²⁰

On the contrary, the "original" readings proposed by the various rabbinic traditions³²¹ are concerned with the implications of the comparison between Miriam and the dead child, whose flesh is half eaten on

316 In commenting on Num 12:12: "On coming from its mother's womb; it should have said, 'from our mother's womb', but Scripture has used a substitute. 'Half of its flesh eaten away'; it should have said, 'Half of our flesh', for 'He is our brother, our own flesh' (Gen 37:27). But Scripture has used a substitute."

317 After listing Num 12:12, comes the following remark: "'Our mother' should have been said, but Scripture has used a substitute."

318 "She does not want to be taken away from our midst; she is our sister. Pray for the dead flesh which is in her, that it may be healed."

319 Cf. op. cit., pp.384-85.

320 Cf. W.E. Barnes, op. cit., pp.406-407.

321 See above, nn.314, 316 and 317.

coming from its mother's womb. Midrashic interpretation such as that found in the Siphre on Num 12:12 tended to forget that it was but a comparison with an anonymous child,³²² and with the help of a text from Gen 37:27,³²³ identified the terms of the comparison with Moses' family and consequently with Moses himself. By juggling with the terms of the comparison, this verse came to be interpreted as though its deepest implications were really referring to Moses and his origins.³²⁴ In this way its "euphemistic" quality was born. Siphre Zutta³²⁵ on Num 12:12 draws attention to the lesson to be learned from this exegetical tradition:

From here, R. Eleazar bar Simeon concluded that if a person had something (unpleasant with reference to himself) to mention, he should word it as if it referred to someone else. ³²⁶

Because the MT form of Num 12:12 does not involve any insuperable obstacles³²⁷ for its comprehension, and since there are no variants in favour of this rabbinic "original", there is no difficulty in concluding that Num 12:12 is not a genuine tiqqun.³²⁸

-
- 322 Difficulties may have arisen with the third person singular suffixes. To whom did they refer? In their attempt to find a meaning for every word and suffix of the Torah, the rabbis would have felt that such questions must have an answer.
- 323 "Let not our hand be upon him (i.e., Joseph) for he is our brother, our own flesh." See above, n.316 and also n.305.
- 324 This interpretation is confirmed by a phrase from the Aboth of Rabbi Nathan, par. 9: "At that time Aaron said to Moses, 'Moses, my brother, do you think that this leprosy is being visited upon Miriam alone? It is being visited indeed upon the flesh of our father, Amran (= the whole family)'. Cf. ed. S. Schechter, Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, Wien-Frankfurt-London 1887, pp.40-41 (text A). Rashi reproduces the midrash of the Siphre when commenting on this verse.
- 325 Cf. ed. H.S Horowitz, op. cit., p.277.
- 326 For further details on this type of literary style, see below, pp.173-174.
- 327 Modern commentators and translators find no difficulty in interpreting the MT phrase, and do not change the text. Only Gray, op. cit., p.127, mentions rabbinic traditions and, presumably without investigation, follows Geiger's inaccurate statement (see above, n.319). W. Rudolph (BHK and BHS) gives the "original" readings as proposed by the rabbinic sources in the critical apparatus of both editions.
- 328 This is the view of Ibn Ezra too; having interpreted the verse in the obvious sense, he adds, "This should not be called a tiqqun of the scribes."

(m) Brief Summary of the Results of this Examination

Only three of the above listed emendations have been accepted as genuine, Zech 2:12, 1 Sam 3:13 and Job 7:20. For each of these cases there exists some significant evidence for the "original" reading, together with contextual arguments in favour of this same variant reading. In the case of the remaining passages, the alleged "original" reading cannot be accepted as genuine, for, apart from the fact that there is no, or at most very slight, textual evidence for such readings, contextual analysis in each case shows that the MT best fits the context. Moreover, the study of rabbinic traditions and methods of interpretation usually helps to uncover how these passages became tiqqunim.

The remaining sections of this study will examine

- (a) certain rabbinic methods of exegesis,³²⁹ and euphemistic idioms and other forms of oblique or substitute expressions,³³⁰ by way of throwing light on the background to the tiqqune sopherim phenomenon as a whole;
- (b) certain other biblical passages which contain genuine emendations undertaken for theological motives.³³¹

However, it is first necessary to examine, in the Excursus which follows, another rabbinic tradition which has very interesting and fruitful points of comparison with that of the tiqqune sopherim.

329 See below, Ch.4.

330 See below, Ch.5.

331 See below, Ch.6.

E X C U R S U S

THE PASSAGES IN THE SEPTUAGINT WHICH
THE SAGES CHANGED FOR KING PTOLEMY

A brief examination of the tradition concerning passages in the Torah which were changed for King Ptolemy¹ now follows. This tradition is of particular interest when compared with the tiqqune sopherim tradition for the following reasons:

- (a) It appears to have come to birth in a somewhat similar milieu.
- (b) The motivation underlying the alleged changes has some points of contact with that underlying the alleged corrections in the tiqqunim traditions.
- (c) The sources attesting the tradition give varying numbers for the total number of passages belonging to the tradition.
- (d) It is possible to test the authenticity of the tradition more objectively by simply comparing the passages in their Hebrew and Greek forms.

The tradition in an early form is attested in the Mekhilta of Rabbi Ishmael² at Ex 12:40. In the exegesis of this passage, which refers to the four hundred and thirty years' slavery in Egypt, reference is made to the Genesis prophecy³ which speaks of four hundred years. One interpretation of the discrepancy in the number of years is that the Exodus passage also refers to the years spent "in the land of Canaan and in the land of Goshen". Then follows the statement that this is one of the passages which they (= the translators of the LXX) wrote⁴ for King Ptolemy. After that comes a list of passages which were also "written" for the king. The passages are all cited in their "changed" form.

The Jerusalem Talmud⁵ attests this same tradition, introducing it

1 King Ptolemy Philadelphus (c. 285-247 B.C.).

2 See above, p.25, nn.1 and 7, for data concerning the history and editions of the Mekhilta.

3 Gen 15:13.

4 The verb used here is כָּתַב, "to write". The Mekhilta lists thirteen passages. See the chart on the following page which gives further details on this passage and the other lists.

5 Megilla 71d.

The Passages in the Septuagint which the Sages changed
for King Ptolemy

	Mekhilta at Ex 12:40	PTal, Megilla 71d	BTal, Megilla 9a	al-Qirqisani pp. 358-359	Shemoth Rabbah V, 5	Tanhuma ed. Shemoth 22
Number stated	13	13	15	10	18	10
Gen 1:1	2	1	1	1	-	1
Gen 1:26	3	2	2	2	-	2
Gen 1:27/ 5:2	4	3	4	3	-	3
Gen 2:2	5	4	3	4	-	4
Gen 11:7	6	5	5	-	-	5
Gen 18:12	7	6	6	-	-	6
Gen 49:6	8	7	7	5	-	7
Ex 4:20	9	8	8	6	1	8
Ex 12:40	1	9	9	7	-	9
Ex 24:5	-	-	10	-	-	10
Ex 24:11	-	-	11	-	-	11
Lev 11:6	13	10	15	8	-	14
Num 16:15	10	11	12	9	-	-
Deut 4:19	11	12	13	10	-	12
Deut 17:3	12	13	14	-	-	13

as follows: "Thirteen Words which the Sages changed⁶ for King Ptolemy". The list which follows is the same as that of the Mekhilta, the only difference being that of order. The Babylonian Talmud⁷ attests these thirteen cases along with two new ones, Ex 24:5 and 24:11.⁸ The context in which the list

6 The verb here and in the subsequent sources is שונה, "to change".

7 Megilla 9a.

8 These two passages according to the Siphre Deuteronomy, par. 356 (ed. L. Finkelstein, Berlin 1939, p.423) and PTal, Ta'anith 68a, belong to

is introduced here is that of the "legend" of the seventy-two elders, each producing the exact same translation in their seventy-two individual rooms, even to the point of being inspired to make the exact same changes out of deference to the Egyptian king's sensibilities!

The Tanḥuma edition⁹ reproduces this expanded form, with two notable differences: firstly, a precise number (ten) is indicated at the beginning, whereas in actual fact, fourteen instances are listed; and secondly, the only omission, when contrasted with the Babylonian Talmud, is that of Num 16:15. Exodus Rabbah,¹⁰ when commenting on Ex 4:20, makes the following observation: "This is one of the Eighteen Words which the Sages changed for King Ptolemy". Finally, al-Qirqisani, in the first section of the "Book of Lights and Watchtowers",¹¹ refers to this tradition, and like the Tanḥuma, mentions a tradition of ten instances.

Thus far, it will be immediately noticed that the variation, within the sources which attest the tradition, regarding the number of passages, is not unlike that described above in the case of the tiqqune sopherim tradition. The earlier sources have fewer passages, while the later attest eighteen.¹² Furthermore, the change in the verb¹³ used to describe the phenomenon also attests, perhaps, a development in the understanding of the tradition, not totally unlike that attested in the variation between the verbs kinnah and tiqgen noted above in the evolution of the traditions.

The motivation underlying the supposed change in the different passages is somewhat varied. It seems possible, that the tradition did indeed have some theological motivation.¹⁴ However, the proposed intention,

another traditional list, that of the variants between the three MSS found in the Temple Scriptorium.

- 9 At Shemoth, par.22, at Ex 4:20. For data on the Tanḥuma traditions and editions, see above, pp.33ff.
- 10 Cf. ed. Halevy, op. cit., Vol. 3, p.85, par. V,5.
- 11 See above, p.41, together with nn.76-77, which describe al-Qirqisani's method of refuting the authenticity of this tradition as a whole.
- 12 Even though the actual number of passages listed did not expand beyond the fifteen of BTal. Exodus Rabbah does not list what the actual eighteen passages were.
- 13 See above, nn.4 and 6. Elijah Mizraḥi uses the verb קנה, "to emend", when speaking of this tradition. See above, p.40, n.71.
- 14 Cf. D. Barthélemy, "Eusèbe, La Septante et 'les Autres'" in La Bible et les Pères, Colloque de Strasbourg 1969, Paris 1971, pp.60-63.

not to offend the sensibilities of King Ptolemy by the presence of affirmations with a polytheistic flavour, etc., may very well have been camouflage for the inclusion of some of the texts which caused problems in the Judaeo-Christian polemic of the early centuries, A.D. Barthélemy shows most convincingly how Gen 1:1 and 1:26, and 11:7 have a common aim,¹⁵ namely the removal from the Bible of any suspicion of polytheism, and, in each case, he quotes rabbinic traditions surrounding these verses. The fact, however, that in each of these three cases, the rendering of the LXX is faithful to the MT raises the question as to the reliability of this tradition as a whole, and its purpose. A comparison of the Hebrew and Greek textual traditions of the other remaining twelve passages shows that in a further five cases¹⁶ the textual evidence of the LXX coincides with that of the MT. The significance of the alleged alternative readings must be sought in traditions other than textual.¹⁷

In the case of Gen 1:27 and its parallel idea in Gen 5:2, the difficulty seems to have consisted in the possible attribution to God of a dual divinity, masculine and feminine, since 1:27 refers to the double creation of man and woman (1:26, in his image).¹⁸ In Genesis Rabbah VIII,11, which follows the Mekhilta and Jerusalem Talmud, this verse is identified as one of those which "they changed for King Ptolemy".¹⁹ The nature of the change at Gen 18:12 and the underlying motivation have all the appearances, but without the formula, of an al-tigre.²⁰ The change in the text, which simply indicates a different vocalisation, makes Sarah laugh "before her relatives" instead of "within herself". The text is "changed" for King Ptolemy so that he might understand that God was angry with Sarah because she laughed publicly at the promise, whereas Abraham had laughed to himself.²¹

15 Cf. op. cit., pp.61-63.

16 Gen 1:27 (= 5:2); 18:12; 49:6; Deut 4:19; 17:3.

17 The background to Gen 1:1,26 and 11:7 is sufficiently detailed by Barthélemy, op. cit., pp.61-63.

18 The proposed change in the BTal and Tanhuma recalls the androgyne myth: "Male and female he created him", whereas the Mekhilta and PTal read "Male with his apertures (וּנְקִבֵּי) he created them", thereby eliminating the creation of woman.

19 Similar indications are also present in Genesis Rabbah at X,9 (2:2); XXXVIII,10 (11:7); XLVIII,17 (18:12) and XCVIII,5 (49:6). They are absent in the case of Gen 1:1 and 1:26.

20 See below, Ch. 4, concerning this exegetical device.

21 Gen 17:17.

However, it seems much more likely that this exegesis and proposed change reflects rabbinic preoccupations first and foremost, and was only later added to the list of passages changed for the king's benefit.

Of the seven passages which remain, five attest the "changed" reading more or less,²² while the remaining two, Ex 24:5 and 11, which were added from a different source,²³ are more complicated.²⁴ The choice of Greek words to translate "ass" in Ex 4:20 and "hare" in Lev 11:6 may have been part of an original nucleus²⁵ to which other passages were then added. Or perhaps the existence of these variants was, post factum, explained by creating a so-called tradition of changes which were made for the king's benefit, by way of defence against the Christian use of the Septuagint and some of its other variant readings.²⁶

The changes present in Gen 2:2 and Ex 12:40 probably reflect the outcome of rabbinic discussions, which may very well have been registered in some Hebrew MSS, including the Vorlage of the LXX. In Gen 2:2, the LXX reads, "And God finished ... on the sixth day and he rested on the seventh day". The background to this change from the Hebrew ("And God finished ... on the seventh day and rested on the seventh day") is reported in Genesis Rabbah.²⁷ Here the image used is that of a man striking a hammer on the

22 Gen 2:2; Ex 4:20; 12:40; Lev 11:6; Num 16:15.

23 See above, n.8.

24 The word זמטוט / זעטוט is very rare, occurring only within these two traditions (i.e., in the variant reading found in the MS in the Temple, which was named "The Book of Za'atutim", because of this variant at Ex 24:5, 11, and the later lists of the changes made for King Ptolemy). See further, PTal, Ta'anith 68a (זעטוט); BTal, Megilla 9a (זמטוט). The exact nuance for its use in these verses is therefore difficult to determine, and consequently, the extent to which the LXX rendering actually reflects a genuine "change".

25 In Ex 4:20 the word τὰ βηρυμια, "beasts of burden", renders the Hebrew חמור, "ass", which is usually translated by ὁ ὄνος, "ass". The intention is obviously to preserve great respect for Moses. In Lev 11:6 the word ὁ χοιροκυβηλλος, "porcupine" is used to translate the Hebrew ארנבת, "hare", out of deference to Ptolemy's wife (sic Megilla 9a; in fact it was Ptolemy's father who was called Λαγῶς! Leviticus Rabbah in loco refers it to Ptolemy's mother!).

26 Cf. in this context the remark of Barthélemy, op. cit., p.61: "ce commentaire (= Mekhila at Ex 12:40) nous prouve que les rabbins des premiers siècles considèrent déjà qu'en cas de divergence, c'est la forme du texte reçu hébraïque qui est originale et que le texte caractéristique de la Septante est le résultat d'une décision prudentielle des traducteurs, décision motivée par la personnalité du destinataire: le roi Ptolémée."

27 Genesis Rabbah X,9. See also Rashi's commentary on Gen 2:2.

anvil, raising it by day and bringing it down by night. In the second between his raising it and his bringing it down, night has begun. So too, God finished his work right at the end of the sixth day, so that in that very moment the Sabbath began. R. Simeon ben Yoḥai said, "Mortal man, who does not know his minutes, his times or his hours, must add from the profane to the sacred; but the Holy One, Blessed be He, who knows his moments, his times and his hours, can enter it by a hair's breath".

Ex 12:40, according to the Septuagint reads: "in the land of Egypt and in the land of Canaan", whereas the Hebrew text reads only "Egypt". There is an obvious discrepancy in the number of years spent in Egypt according to Gen 15:13 (400 years) and Ex 12:40 (430 years). One way out of this difficulty is reported in the Mekhilta at Ex 12:40, in the name of Rabbi: "The Holy One, blessed be he, said: 'when they do repentance I will redeem them according to generations; when they do not, I will redeem them according to years (i.e. in hundreds)'". Genesis Rabbah LXIII, 3 tries to solve the difficulty by interpreting the phrase "sons of Israel" as including the periods of sojourning after the birth of Isaac, as follows:

Abraham was called Israel.²⁸ R. Nathan said:
this is a profound teaching (it explains the verse):
'Now the time that the sons of Israel dwelt in
Egypt and in the land of Canaan and in the land of
Goshen was four hundred and thirty years'.

It was most likely that discussions such as these were responsible for the entry into some Hebrew textual traditions, as witnessed by the Septuagint Vorlage, of the expanded reading, which was subsequently eliminated from the Hebrew MSS by the unification and standardisation of the Hebrew consonantal text at Jamnia.

In any event, one overall significant conclusion to this analysis may be drawn as follows: the tradition concerning the passages in the Septuagint which the sages changed for King Ptolemy contains some element of truth,²⁹ together with some measure of inaccuracy. It is clear that not all fifteen cases were genuinely changed. Qirqisani was correct to point out that the Christians, who took over the Bible in its Septuagint dress,

28 Thus, the "sons of Israel" begins with Isaac, son of Abraham who was called Israel; hence the sojourn in Canaan etc. must be included.

29 There exist genuine textual variants between the Hebrew and Greek texts (cf. above n.22). It is not possible to establish with certitude, however, whether there is any truth in the story which maintains that these changes were expressly made for the benefit of King Ptolemy, especially since the greater number of so-called changes are inaccurate.

were not slow to use Gen 1:26 as a basis for their "anthropomorphic" doctrine of God making men in his image, and they could only do this if the Septuagint text coincided with the Hebrew.³⁰ But he was not correct in totally rejecting what the tradition was drawing attention to, namely, some genuine textual differences between the two. The actual number of authentic changes made for King Ptolemy is less important than the fact that the tradition clearly draws attention to some specific differences existing in the Septuagint text, regardless of whatever the reasons for these changes may have been.

A very direct and helpful parallel can therefore be drawn between this tradition and the tiqqune sopherim lists. The previous section (Ch.3) attempted to show that while there were some genuine emendations within the lists,³¹ the greater number of those listed were not genuine textual changes, but merely the result of various kinds of midrashic and homiletic exegesis.³² The existence of this parallel tradition with the same types of complexity and inaccuracy, which can be more easily and objectively checked, serves to reinforce the conclusions regarding the tiqqune sopherim tradition.

In short, it can be said that:

- (a) both contain genuine changes/emendations;
- (b) both contain alleged changes which have their raison d'être in midrashic exegesis and sources rather than in textual criticism;
- (c) both contain varying numbers of instances in their lists, but neither goes beyond the figure eighteen (really or ideally);
- (d) neither list is comprehensive, since the types of textual difficulties to which they draw attention exist in other passages of the Bible not mentioned in either list.

30 Cf. L. Nemoy, "al-Qirqisani's account of Jewish sects and Christianity", HUCA 7 (1930) pp.359-60.

31 Cf. above pp.61-81 (Zech 2:12; Job 7:20; 1 Sam 3:13).

32 Cf. below, pp.162-166.

CHAPTER 4

A STUDY OF THE AL-TIQRE EXEGETICAL DEVICE WITH
PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE EARLY MIDRASHIM AND
THE BABYLONIAN TALMUD

1. Introductory Remarks

Examination of the official list of tigqune sopherim in the preceding section has already occasioned reference to the midrashic formula, al-tiqre ... ella ...¹ and in certain cases,² the suggestion has been made that it was this method of interpretation of the biblical text that facilitated the entry of these cases into the official lists of eighteen emendations. This present section will be devoted to a more thorough investigation of this formula, in an attempt to provide a wider general background of rabbinic exegesis and scribal activity, against which the emergence of the tigqune sopherim can be better appreciated. It is also the aim of this section to determine, through illustrations of the various types of rearrangement of the biblical text by means of this formula, whatever relationships and interdependence that may exist between the two phenomena.

In simplest terms, the al-tiqre formula may be described as an exegetical device, well attested in the tannaitic Midrashim³ and Talmud,⁴ as well as in the later exegetical⁵ and homiletic⁶ Midrashim, having as its

1 See above, p.75 (Gen 18:22); p.88, n.141 (2 Sam 20:1 and parallels); cf. W. Bacher, *Die Terminologie*, Vol. 1, pp.175-77; Vol. 2, p.194; A. Arzi, "Al Tikrei" in *EJ*, Vol. 2, p.776.

2 (a) 2 Sam 20:1 and parallels; (b) Num 12:12.

3 (a) The Mekhilta of R. Ishmael at the following eight verses: Ex 12:13, 17; 14:22,29; 16:15; 17:8; 18:27; 19:17 (the Mekhilta of Simeon ben Yoḥai contains one of these eight cases, Ex 14:22).
(b) Siphra at Lev 20:13.
(c) Siphre on Numbers at 11:32a and 32b.
(d) Siphre on Deuteronomy at the following eleven verses: 11:21; 31:14; 32:15,17,20,21,24,25; 33:4; 34:2,7.

4 BTal contains at least one hundred instances of this formula.

5 Cf. Genesis Rabbah II,3; XIX,8; XLV,9; Lamentations Rabbah II,2; Ecclesiastes Rabbah I,4,4.

6 Cf. Leviticus Rabbah XVIII,3; Pesiqta de Rab Kahana 80b; 179b; 197a; 201a; Numbers Rabbah XVI,1.

function the introduction of other interpretations based on a change of either the vocalised or consonantal text, or both concurrently. Such alternative readings were never intended to be in competition with, or to supplant the official text; they were simply understood as additional meanings, sometimes supporting the obvious or current interpretation of the halakah or haggadah, sometimes introducing a totally unconnected anecdote or skilful play on words. This practice, therefore, was on a very different level from the official functions of the scribes as recorded in the Talmud:⁷

The pronunciation fixed by the Sopherim, the cancelling (of Vav) by the Sopherim, words read which are not written in the text, and vice versa words written in the text which are cancelled in reading, are a law of Moses on Sinai.⁸

This technique belongs to the realm of midrashic and homiletic exegesis, and has, as will be seen, no direct bearing on textual criticism. Consequently, the need was never felt to have to explain the sense in which the formula was used. It was obvious to all concerned. The actual formula occurs in three slightly different modalities:

- (a) אל תקרי ... אלא⁹ / אל תקרא ... אלא¹⁰
- (b) אל תהי קורא ... אלא¹¹
- (c) קרי ביה¹² / קרי בו¹³ / קרא בו¹⁴

The most common form by far is the first one, al-tiqre ... ella...

2. Types of Changes Associated with this Formula

The following summary of the types of changes associated with the al-tiqre formula is not intended to be exhaustive. Its aim is to give a general idea of the types most frequently found attested in the early Midrashim and Babylonian Talmud, together with an occasional reference to some of the other later Midrashim. The types may be grouped into the ten categories which follow below.

⁷ Nedarim 37b-38a.

⁸ The translation is that of Ginsburg, Introduction, p.308.

⁹ Mekhilta at Ex 12:13 and 14:29, etc.; the majority of the BTal cases; cf. Berakoth 5a; 7b; 10a; etc.; Pesiqta 80b; 197a.

¹⁰ Mekhilta at Ex 14:22; 19:17; Leviticus Rabbah XVIII,3.

¹¹ Siphre on Numbers at 11:32a and 32b; PTal, Sanhedrin 27d.

¹² Siphra at Lev 20:13; Sanhedrin 54b; Kerithoth 3a; Tanḥuma, Shalah 1.

¹³ Genesis Rabbah XLV,9.

¹⁴ Numbers Rabbah XVI,1.

(a) Change in Vocalisation

This is by far the most common type of al-tiqre. Almost half of the al-tiqre in the Babylonian Talmud are of this kind, while the early Midrashim also have a proportionally significant number. In the Mekhilta at Ex 12:17 the following change of vocalisation is proposed: "'And ye shall observe the (Feast of) Unleavened Bread (ha-massot)'". R. Josiah says: Do not read it so, but: 'ye shall observe the commandments (ha-miswot)'".¹⁵

Other examples of a simple change in vocalisation are as follows: Ex 14:29, do not read חמה, "wall", but חמה, "anger";¹⁶ Ps 78:25, do not read אַפְרִים, "of strong horses" but אַבְרִים, "of limbs";¹⁷ 2 Chron 24:24, do not read שְׁפָטִים, "judgments", but שְׂפָטִים, "sports";¹⁸ Deut 32:20, do not read אֱמֶן, "faithfulness", but אָמֵן, "Amen";¹⁹ Gen 27:27, do not read בְּגָדָיו, "his garments", but בְּגָדָיו, "his traitors";²⁰ Deut 23:14, do not read אֵיזֶנֶה, "your weapons", but אֶזְנֶה, "your ear";²¹ Josh 2:1, do not read חָרָץ, "secretly", but חָרָץ, "earthware".²² These are but a few of the many instances of how a simple change of vocalisation opened up new avenues for imaginative interpretation.

(b) Metathesis of Two Consonants in a Word

Such changes often occur spontaneously in a language. Two such examples in the biblical text are: כֶּשֶׁב²³ and כֶּשֶׁב²⁴ (sheep), שְׂמֵלָה²⁵ and שְׂמֵלָה²⁶ (garment). However, some specific examples containing the al-tiqre formula will illustrate how the rabbis made deliberate use of metathesis in order to further their exegeses. A good early example is present in the Siphre on Numbers at 11:32b where the verb וַיִּשְׁטְחוּ, "and they spread about", is to

15 Cf. n.91 below.

16 Mekhilta at Ex 14:29,

17 Mekhilta at Ex 16:15.

18 Mekhilta at Ex 17:8.

19 Siphre on Deuteronomy at 32:20.

20 Sanhedrin 37a.

21 Kethubboth 5a.

22 Numbers Rabbah XVI, 1.

23 Cf. Lev 3:7; 4:35; 7:23; 22:27; Num 18:17; etc.

24 Cf. Lev 4:32; 12:6; 14:21, 24,25; 23:12; etc.

25 Cf. Gen 9:23; Deut 10:18; 22:17; Judg 8:25; Is 3:6,7; Is 9:4 etc.

26 Cf. Ex 22:8; 1 Kings 11:29,30; Mich 2:8; Ps 104:2; etc.

be read וישחטו , "and they slaughtered".²⁷ In Ps 29:2 the word בהדרה , "in majesty", undergoes a double change, when, according to the formula, it is to be read as בחררה , "with reverence",²⁸ and in Ps 49:12 the word קרבם , "their inner thought", is to be read as קברם , "their grave".²⁹ Finally, in Ps 68:18 the word שנאן , "repeated", is to be read according to the al-tiqre formula as שאינן , "that are not".³⁰

It has already been suggested that the origins of the tiqqune sopherim in 2 Sam 20:1 and the parallel passages of 1 Kings 12:16 and 2 Chron 10:16 are to be found precisely in this particular type of al-tiqre and that their passage from the realm of an al-tiqre type of exegesis to the more formal standing of tiqqune sopherim was facilitated because of the theological implications contained in the alternative reading.³¹

(c) Substitution of One Consonant for Another

Quite a number of al-tiqre instances involve the substitution of one consonant for another, particularly frequent in the case of the four gutturals, and the letters ו, ש and ד. Ps 29:2 has already been mentioned, where the heth takes the place of he.³² An early example may be found in Ex 12:13: "'I will pass over you.' R. Josiah says: do not read uphasahti (I will pass over) but uphasa'ti (I will spring over). God skipped over the houses of his children in Egypt..."³³ In Lev 26:16, associated with the name of R. Eleazar b. Judah, the word בהלה , "with terror", is to be read as בחלה , "on account of (the neglect of) hallah" (i.e. the portion of dough which belongs to the priest).³⁴ The fact that the prepositions אל "unto",

27 In the Siphre, this interpretation is attributed to Rabbi Judah. In Yoma 75b, where this example is also present, the saying is attributed to Resh Laqish and the al-tiqre formula is extended to the substantive שטח , "a spreading", in the same verse, which, according to Rabbi Joshua b. Qarḥah, is to be read as שחוט , "(ritually) slaughtered".

28 Berakoth 30b.

29 Mo'ed Qaṭan 9b. In point of fact, this is the reading attested by the Versions and selected by the Committee responsible for the HOTTP as representing the "earliest attested text".

30 'Aboda Zara 3b.

31 See above, pp. 88 ff.; see below, pp. 163-164.

32 Berakoth 30b; see above, n.28.

33 Mekhilta at Ex 12:13.

34 Shabbath 32b. It is noteworthy that the Samaritan Pentateuch also attests this alternative ("ritually" oriented) reading for Lev 26:16.

and על, "upon", are often confused in the biblical text made it easy for an al-tiqre to be developed à propos of Num 11:2: "R. Eleazar also said: Moses spoke insolently towards heaven, as it says 'And Moses prayed unto the LORD.' Read not 'el (unto) the LORD, but 'al (against) the LORD."³⁵

In Genesis Rabbah discussion of the creation of light (Gen 1:3) occasions a reference to Is 41:2 where the allusion to Abraham being "stirred up from the east" is further elaborated by means of an al-tiqre: "Read not העיר but האיר."³⁶

Some examples of exchange between the consonants ש, ט and ס are as follows: Gen 49:21, do not read אמרי שפר, "goodly words", but אמרי ספר, "words of a document";³⁷ Is 7:3, do not read כובס, "fuller", but כובש, "taking cover (for shame)";³⁸ Is 57:5, do not read שוחטי, "that slay", but סוחטי, "that press out";³⁹ 1 Sam 2:5, do not read שבעים, "they that were full", but שבעים, "seventy";⁴⁰ Ps 16:11, do not read שבע, "fullness", but שבע, "seven";⁴¹ Prov 19:23, do not read שבע, "satisfied", but שבע, "seven".⁴²

Finally, four other examples of substitution of other consonants complete the illustration of this category of al-tiqre: Gen 25:23, do not read גוים, "nations" but גיים, "lords";⁴³ 1 Kings 14:9, do not read גויר, "thy back", but גאיר, "thy pride";⁴⁴ Eccles 8:10, do not read קבורים, "buried", but קבוצים, "collected"⁴⁵ and do not read וישתכחו, "and were forgotten" but וישתבחו, "and triumphed".⁴⁶

(d) Metathesis in the Structure of a Phrase

In the early Midrashim this type of al-tiqre occurs in the Siphre on

35 Berakoth 32a.

36 Genesis Rabbah II,3.

37 Sotā 13a.

38 PTal, Sanhedrin 27d.

39 Nidda 13a.

40 Megilla 15b.

41 'Arakin 13b.

42 Berakoth 14a; cf. 55b.

43 Berakoth 57b; 'Aboda Zara 11a.

44 Berakoth 10b.

45 Gittin 56b.

46 Ibid.

Deuteronomy at 11:21 à propos of Eccles 1:4:⁴⁷ "A generation goes, and a generation comes, but the earth remains forever". The al-tiqre applies to the sequence "generation ... generation ... earth" which is to be read "earth .. earth ... generation". The context in which the al-tiqre occurs is a discussion of whether the Torah was created for the sake of Israel or vice versa. The argument continues on the theme that since the Torah, which was created for the sake of Israel, endures for all eternity, how much more must Israel, for whose sake it was created, endure for all eternity. This statement provides the opportunity for comment on Eccles 1:4 which speaks of the transience of man in contrast to the durability of earth. Rabbi Joshua ben Qarḥah, by means of an al-tiqre, presents the text as follows: "The earth passes away and the earth comes, but the generation abides forever", and develops his basic argument, that the earth was created for man, accordingly.

This type of al-tiqre is of particular interest when compared with the tiqqene sopherim traditions surrounding Gen 18:22, where the alleged correction has to do with the rearrangement of the sequence of the two persons in the verse, Yahweh and Abraham.⁴⁸

(e) Omission of a Consonant

Three examples are selected for illustration of this type of change: Deut 32:17, do not read שָׁעִרוּם, "they dreaded", but שָׁעוּם, "they made smooth";⁴⁹ Deut 8:9, do not read אֲבִנֶיהָ, "its stones", but בְּנֵיהָ, "its builders";⁵⁰ and Ps 33:1, do not read נֹאמָה, "comely", but נוֹה, "a habitation".⁵¹ It is noteworthy that in the last two cases it is the letter 'aleph' which is omitted.⁵²

(f) Addition of an Extra Word

Two examples are presented for illustration of this type of al-tiqre Prov 4:22, do not read לְמַצְאֵיהֶם, "to those that find them", but לְמוֹצֵיאֵיהֶם בָּפֶה,

47 This tradition is also recounted in Ecclesiastes Rabbah, I, 4 no.4. Cf. W. Bacher, Die Agada der Tannaiten, Vol.2, p.319.

48 Cf. pp. 70-76 ; see below pp.162-163.

49 Siphre on Deuteronomy.

50 Ta'anith 4a.

51 Sota 9a.

52 See above, p.78, à propos of 1 Sam 3:13, where the emendation is effected through the omission of 'aleph'.

"to him who utters them with his mouth";⁵³ and Song 4:3, do not read רקתך, "thy cheeks", but רקנין שכך, "thy worthless ones".⁵⁴

(g) Addition of One or More Consonants

There are a number of instances of this type of al-tiqre in the Siphre on Deuteronomy: 32:25, do not read שיבה, "grey hair", but ישיבה, "Session"; 33:4, do not read מורשה, "inheritance", but מאורסה, "betrothed"⁵⁵ and 34:2, do not read עד הים, "as far as the sea", but עד היום, "until the day". Other instances are recorded in the Talmud: Gen 2:1, do not read צבאם, "their host", but צביונם, "their beauty";⁵⁶ Ez 16:7, do not read בעדרי עדרים, "with ornaments", but בעדרי עדרים, "in flocks";⁵⁷ Ps 3:8, do not read שברה, "thou hast broken", but שרכבת, "thou hast lengthened".⁵⁸

(h) Subdivision of a Word into Two

One of the earliest examples of this type of al-tiqre is present in the Mekhilta⁵⁹ à propos of Ps 68:28. The story surrounding the change of text is worth recording as a good illustration of haggadic exposition:

R. Meir says: when the tribes of Israel stood by the sea, one said "I will go down to the sea first" and the other said: "I will go down to the sea first." While they were thus standing there wrangling with each other, the tribe of Benjamin jumped up and went down to the sea first. For it says: "There is Benjamin, the youngest ruling them" (Ps 68:28). Do not read rodem, "ruling them", but rod yam, "braving the sea".⁶⁰

Another interesting subdivision occurs in Ps 72:20,⁶¹ having for motive the underlining of David's pious practices. Instead of reading the verse "The prayers of David, the son of Jesse, are ended (פְּלִי), the al-tiqre proposes the following reading: "All these (כָּל אֱלֹהֵי) are the prayers of David, the

53 'Erubin 54a.

54 Hagiga 27a; cf. 'Erubin 19a.

55 This instance is also recorded in Berakoth 57a and Pesahim 49b.

56 Rosh Hashana 11a.

57 Soṭa 11b.

58 Berakoth 54b; Megilla 15b; Sota 12b. Other instances in the Talmud may be found in Megilla 28a (Gen 20:16); Zebahim 115b (Ex 29:43); 'Erubin 54b (Deut 31:19).

59 Mekhilta at Ex 14:22, which treats of the crossing through the Red Sea.

60 The translation is that of J. Lauterbach, op. cit. Vol.1, p.232. This tradition is also reported in the Mekhilta of R. Simeon b. Yohai, (J. N. Epstein and E. Z. Melamed edition), pp.62-63, and in Bṭal, Soṭa 36b - 37a.

son of Jesse". This change is introduced as part of R. Meir's teaching: "All the praises which are stated in the book of Psalms, David uttered all of them".⁶²

(i) Reading Two Words as One

Genesis Rabbah records an imaginative rendering of the angel's prophecy to Hagar concerning her son, Ishmael.⁶³ The biblical text of Gen 16:12 reads: "He shall be a wild ass of a man, his hand against every man and every man's hand against him" (כל בו). By reading these two words as one, the following interpretation is achieved: "His hand and his dog's (כלבו) are alike. Just as his dog eats carrion, so does he eat carrion". Nowhere else do we learn that Ishmael possessed a dog!

(j) Change of a Personal Suffix or Pronoun

For this category of al-tiqe four illustrations are presented as follows: Deut 29:8, do not read אֲנִי, "them", but אַתְּ, "yourselves";⁶⁴ Ps 101:5, do not read אִנִּי, "him", but אִתִּי, "with him";⁶⁵ Num 13:31, do not read מִמֶּנּוּ, "than we", but מִמֶּנּוּ, "than He";⁶⁶ and Ps 94:12, do not read תִּלְמַדְנִי, "thou teachest him", but תִּלְמַדְנֵנוּ, "thou teachest us".⁶⁷ Although these four instances rightly belong to the first category treated above, namely, change in vocalisation, they are singled out here because they bear some structural resemblance to those various cases among the official tiqqune sopherim, where the alleged emendations consisted in a change of personal suffix or pronoun.⁶⁸

61 Pesahim 117a.

62 Pesahim 117a (*ibid.*). Other examples of this type of subdivision may be found in the Talmud as follows: Sukka 49a (Gen 1:1); Menahoth 29b (Gen 2:4); Shabbath 89a (Ex 32:1); Shabbath 118b (Is 56:2); Sanhedrin 22a (Ps 68:7) and Yoma 38a (Song 1:7).

63 Genesis Rabbah XLV, 9.

64 Sanhedrin 99b.

65 Soṭa 5a; 'Arakin 15b.

66 Menahoth 53b; Soṭa 35a.

67 Berakoth 5a.

68 See p.165 below.

3. Types of Meaning or Exegesis Resulting from the Use of this Formula

If the types of changes associated with the al-tiqre formula are many and varied, as the above paragraphs have shown, the same may be equally said for the types of meanings or exegesis which result from the "new" reading. The following paragraphs attempt to classify in broad terms some of the main types of exegesis which follow upon the use of this formula.

(a) Having to Do with God

Surprisingly enough, not many of the al-tiqre have to do directly with God.⁶⁹ In Megilla 14a, R. Judah b. Menashia contrasts God's immortality with human transience by reading the biblical text of 1 Sam 2:2, "For there is none besides thee" (בלתך), as "For there is none to survive thee" (לבלותך);⁷⁰ he then develops his theme as follows:

For the nature of the Holy One, blessed be He, is not like that of flesh and blood. It is the nature of flesh and blood to be survived by its works, but God survives his works. "Neither is there any rock (צור) like our God". There is no artist (צַר) like our God. A man draws a figure on a wall, but is unable to endow it with breath and spirit, inward parts and intestines. But the Holy One, blessed be He, fashions a form and endows it with breath and spirit, inward parts and intestines. 71

The commentary on the second part of 1 Sam 2:2 is included above as it illustrates that many times a latent al-tiqre can exist.⁷²

69 The following instances have to do with God in a less direct manner: Deut 33:2 (read not, "The LORD came from Mt. Sinai" but "to Mt. Sinai", cf. Mekhilta at Ex 19:17); Ez 48:35 (read not, "The LORD is there" but "The LORD is its name", cf. Baba Bathra 75b); Ps 68:36 (read not, "Awful is God out of thy holy places" but "Through thy consecrated ones", cf. Zebahim 115b).

70 It was concerning God's immortality that an alleged emendation was deemed necessary in Hab 1:12. See pp.105-110 above.

71 The translation is that of M. Simon, Mo'ed, Vol. 4, Megilla, p.83 in I. Epstein's English edition of The Babylonian Talmud, London 1961.

72 A very interesting exegesis is present in Genesis Rabbah IX,5 without the al-tiqre formula, à propos of Gen 1:31: "And behold it was very good". R. Meir's copy of the Pentateuch contained the following word-play after the biblical verse: "And behold death (מָוֶת is read as מוֹת) was(very)good". Then follows a discussion among some of the later rabbis concerning the positive aspects of death. See also Genesis Rabbah XIX,6 where there is a clever word-play à propos of חַמָּה (Gen 3:7), again without the al-tiqre formula: "And they sewed the leaves of the fig (te'edah) together. R. Simeon ben Yoḥai said, That is the leaf which brought the occasion (to'anah) for death into the world".

(b) Man in his Relationship with God

Berakoth 31b-32a contains a series of three references where, according to R. Eleazar, different people "spoke insolently towards Heaven."⁷³ The third of these concerns Moses, who is made to "speak insolently" by means of an al-tiqre formula; the innocent biblical expression, "And Moses prayed unto (ל) the LORD" is transformed into "And Moses prayed against (ל) the LORD". The end product of this type of interpretation would seem to have been the very antithesis of the motivation behind the alleged tiqqun in Num 12:12.⁷⁴

A change in the personal pronoun (אני to אני) in Ps 101:5 by means of an al-tiqre enabled R. H̥isda to develop his interpretation of the verse as follows: "Every man in whom is haughtiness of spirit, the Holy One, blessed be He, declares, I and he cannot both dwell in the world."⁷⁵ It is hardly necessary to elaborate in any further detail the view of man and his importance in relation to God and the world occasioned by the metathesis in Eccles 1:4 which has already been mentioned above.⁷⁶

(c) Clarification or Illustration of Prescriptions of the Law

Lev 20:13 contains a prohibition against homosexuality and decrees death for both offending parties. Lev 18:22 contains the same prohibition in a slightly different formulation and without reference to any penalty, simply calling it an "abomination". The Siphra at Lev 20:13⁷⁷ records a difference of opinion between R. Ishmael and R. Aqiba regarding the interpretation of this prohibition. R. Ishmael cites two biblical passages, one as containing the formal prohibition for "The one who lies with (שוכב)",⁷⁸ and one as containing the formal prohibition for "The one who is lain with (נשכב)".⁷⁹ R. Aqiba, however, succinctly finds the two prohibitions formally contained in the one verse (Lev 18:22) by means of an al-tiqre:⁸⁰

73 1 Sam 1:10 (Hannah); 1 Kings 18:37 (Elijah) and Num 11:2 (Moses).

74 See above, pp.126-128.

75 Soṭa 5a and 'Arakin 15b both contain this tradition of R. H̥isda.

76 See above, p.143f.

77 Siphra Edition, Jerusalem 1958, p.94a.

78 Lev 18:22.

79 Deut 23:18.

80 Here, however, the formula is קרי ביה; see above, n.12. So too, in the talmudic instances which further elaborate this difference of opinion, Sanhedrin 54b and Kerithoth 3a.

R. Aqiba said, לֹא תִשָּׁכַב, "Thou shalt not lie" ...
 Read לֹא תִשָּׁכַב, "Thou shalt not be lain with." 81

Sanhedrin 54b reproduces the basic sequence of thought of the Siphra text, with additional material, and develops the discussion in such a way as to show that the one who engages in homosexual activity, in R. Ishmael's view, is liable to two penalties because he is violating two biblical prohibitions,⁸² whereas, in R. Aqiba's view, "He incurs only one penalty, since 'Thou shalt not lie (with)' and 'Thou shalt not be lain with' is but one statement."⁸³

Kerithoth 3a has a different interpretation of R. Aqiba's al-tiqre. In this tractate, the focus is not so much on the derivation of the prohibitions from biblical texts as such, but rather on the liability for the transgressor in terms of the number of sin-offerings required. In the view of R. Ishmael, the offender of the prohibition against homosexuality is liable to two sin-offerings,⁸⁴ whereas, in R. Aqiba's view, he is liable to one sin-offering, since he (i.e., R. Aqiba) derives both prohibitions from the one text, Lev 18:22, interpreted both as לֹא תִשָּׁכַב, "Thou shalt not lie...", and לֹא תִשָּׁכַב, "Thou shalt not cause to lie...". Thus, in this tractate, the al-tiqre is presented in the hiph'il,⁸⁵ and not niph'al, as in the Siphra and Sanhedrin texts.

Another good example from the early Midrashim for the use of the al-tiqre for this type of exegesis is to be found in the Siphre on Numbers at 11:32, where two separate instances are present. The biblical verse recounts the episode of the Israelites spending all day and all night and the

81 Siphra Edition, p.94a.

82 Lev 18:22 as agent; Deut 23:18 as recipient.

83 The translation is that of H. Freedman, Nezikin, Vol. 3, Sanhedrin, p.369 in Epstein's translation, op. cit.; the explanation given on p.369, n.2 is helpful: "Though differently vocalised in order to deduce two injunctions, it is nevertheless one statement only, so that a person transgressing these two injunctions violates one Biblical prohibition only."

84 Since R. Ishmael maintains that there are two distinct prohibitions based on two different texts (Lev 18:22 and Deut 23:18).

85 The immediately preceding context in Kerithoth 3a, which reports R. Abbahu's interpretation of R. Ishmael's view, contains the sequence qal-hiph'il of the verb בוא, "to come", with a meaning which is exactly parallel to R. Aqiba's double reading of the one verb שכב, "to lie (with)", in qal and hiph'il. It thus confirms the hiph'il rather than the niph'al reading of the al-tiqre alternative in this passage.

following day collecting the quails so that even "He who gathered least gathered ten homers". The first al-tigre is presented anonymously: Read not הממעט, "he who (gathered) least", but הממעט, "he who is excluded", and the text then elaborates on the technical term of "One who is ritually excluded", namely, "The sluggards, the cripples and the lame (who) collected one hundred khors". The second half of the verse contains the verb נשט, "to spread about". R. Judah ben Ilay is reported as saying: Read not, "And they spread about" but "And they slaughtered", thereby indicating that the quails belonged to a species that required ritual killing (נשט).⁸⁶

Certain other instances of this formula, particularly on texts from Leviticus, are similarly concerned with requirements of a ritual nature,⁸⁷ or with failure to observe some of the finer details of the Law.⁸⁸ An interesting exegesis is developed in Shabbath 118b à propos of Is 56:2. The tradition is reported by R. Hiyya b. Abba, in R. Johanan's name:

He who observes the Sabbath according to its law, even if he practises idolatry, like the generation of Enosh, is forgiven, for it is said, "Blessed is Enosh⁸⁹ that does this..."⁹⁰ Read not מחללו, 'from profaning it', but מחול לו, 'he is forgiven'.

It certainly requires a fertile imagination to be able to reconcile the practice of idolatry with observance of the Sabbath and to be able to cite Scripture in support of it, even with the help of an al-tigre!

(d) To Bring out a "Moral" for Conduct

It is in this area of meaning that the greatest use appears to have been made of the al-tigre formula. This is not surprising, if it is kept in mind that this formula was a device which enabled the rabbis to use the biblical text as a spring-board for many novel and sometimes otherwise unconnected interpretations. This was particularly true in the realm of

86 See above, n.27.

87 Cf. Lev 1:5 (cf. Hullin 27a); Lev 25:21 (Rosh Hashana 13a-b); Gen 1:1 (Sukka 49a); 1 Kings 14:9 (Berakoth 10b).

88 Lev 24:18 (Baba Qamma 10b); Lev 26:16 (Shabbath 32b); Lev 26:23 (Shabbath 33a).

89 According to tradition, idolatry began in the days of Enosh; cf. Gen 4:26. The Hebrew text in Is 56:2 has אנוש which is usually translated "man".

90 Is 56:2: Blessed is the man who does this,
And the son of man who holds it fast,
Who keeps the Sabbath, not profaning it,
And keeps his hand from doing evil.

norms and exhortations for practical living and spiritual guidance, so that the al-tiqre formula had a characteristic homiletic role. The growth of that body of literature entitled haggadah (from the verb hagged, to impart instruction) was the result of the development of a whole host of homiletic interpretations of the Bible, and represents to a large extent the preaching that took place on the Sabbath on a regular basis. The al-tiqre formula was a particularly apt and fruitful method of interpretation which the preachers used in order to respond to the events of the times, the mood and interests of the audience, and especially the need to communicate authentic faith values. Some examples will give an idea of the range of meanings thus encompassed.

The al-tiqre in the Mekhilta at Ex 12:17, which proposes "the commandments" in place of "unleavened bread", has already been mentioned,⁹¹ together with its practical application:

Just as one should not be slow when making the massah lest it leaven, so one should not be slow to perform a religious duty. If a religious duty comes upon your way, perform it immediately.

An al-tiqre centred on חָרַת, "graven", transforming it into חֲרִית, "freedom"⁹² provided R. Aḥa b. Jacob with the opportunity of observing that "No nation would have had any power over Israel ...", making the point that if Israel had observed the commandments, she would have preserved her freedom.⁹³

Kethubboth 5a-b records a very practical interpretation of Deut 23:14: "Bar Qappera (also) expounded, What does 'And thou shalt have a peg among thy implements' mean? Do not read 'thy implements' but 'upon thy ear'; so that if a man hears an unworthy thing he shall plug his finger into his ear." Some al-tiqre formulae centre on the saying of various prayers: at Ex 23:25 the formula has for function the illustration from a biblical verse of why a blessing must be said before food;⁹⁴ at Is 2:22 it facilitates a warning against greeting one's fellow-man before saying one's prayers;⁹⁵ and at Ps 68:15, distinct pronunciation of the Shema brings the reward of having the temperature in hell lowered!⁹⁶

91 See above, n.15.

92 'Erubin 54a (Ex 32:16).

93 Cf. John 8:32 (The truth will make you free).

94 Berakoth 48b.

95 Berakoth 14a; cf. Soṭa 4b.

96 Berakoth 15b: "R. Ḥama ben Ḥanina said, If in reciting the Shema one

The saying of "Amen" in Temple and talmudic times was a very important form of participation in the service, not only because congregational worship mainly consisted of one person speaking and the rest responding "Amen" at appropriate intervals, but also because many participants would not have understood the language of the prayer texts and so the response was all the more important.⁹⁷ Consequently, it is not surprising to find at least two instances where the al-tiqre has been used in order to promote the importance of responding "Amen". The biblical verse in Deut 32:20b reads

For they are a perverse generation,
Children in whom is no faithfulness.

The Siphre on Deuteronomy at this verse cites a number of instances of this lack of faithfulness and then continues in the name of R. Dosthai b. Judah: "Do not read 'There is no faithfulness in them' but 'There is no Amen in them'." Reference is then made to the fact that "There was not even one among them that opened his mouth and answered 'Amen' until the arrival of Jeremiah who answered 'Amen'."⁹⁸ In Shabbath 119b, Resh Laqish says: "He who responds 'Amen' with all his might has the gates of Paradise opened for him, as it is written, 'Open the gates, that the righteous nation which keeps faith may enter in'.⁹⁹ Do not read שומר אמנים, 'that keeps faith' but שאומרים אמן, 'who say Amen'.¹⁰⁰ The same al-tiqre is used à propos of Is 26:2 in a different context in Sanhedrin 110b. The discussion in progress there centres on the question, "From what age may an infant enter the future world?" Various opinions of the different rabbis are cited, and then follows that of R. Meir: "From when he says 'Amen' (to the prayers in the Synagogue) and then he introduces the al-tiqre in much the same form as in Shabbath 119b."¹⁰¹

pronounces the letters distinctly, hell is cooled for him ...". Other uses of the formula in this context include Gen 2:1 (Shabbath 119b) and Prov 22:9 (Soṭa 38b).

97 Cf. Berakoth 53b: "R. Jose says, Greater is he who answers 'Amen' than he who says the blessing."

98 Jer 11:5.

99 Is 26:2.

100 This is the text of Talmud Bavli, reprint of the Wilna edition, Jerusalem 1958-61. Cf. W. Bacher, Die Agāda der Tannaiten, Vol. 2, pp.22ff.

101 In Sanhedrin 110b, the participle is singular, as in the biblical text. This same tradition of R. Meir is also reported in PTal, Shebi'ith 35c, where the alternative reading is present, but without the actual al-tiqre formula.

Encouragement for diligent study of the Torah is not lacking in those al-tigre formulae which have a practical aim in view. A good example is cited by R. Safra on the authority of R. Joshua b. Ḥanania¹⁰² à propos of Deut 6:7: "What is meant by 'And you shall teach them diligently to your children'? Read not וְשִׁנְנָתָם, 'and you shall teach them diligently' but וְשִׁלַּשְׁתָּם, 'and you shall divide them into three'", and he then recommends the division of one's time into three, one portion for the study of the Miqrah, one portion for the Mishnah and the final third for the Talmud. Is 3:3 provides another example: "Do not read שָׂר חֲמִשִּׁים, 'the captain of fifty', but שָׂר חֲמִשִּׁין, 'the captain of the Pentateuch', it means the one who knows how to argue in the five books of the Torah."¹⁰³ Two examples concerned with halakah are as follows: Hab 3:6, "Whoever repeats halakoth may rest assured that he is destined for the future world, as it says, 'His ways are to eternity'. Read not הַלִּיכוֹת, 'ways', but הִלְכוֹת, 'halakoth'. "¹⁰⁴ Ps 45:5: "When two scholars sharpen each other in halakah, the Holy One, blessed be He, gives them success, for it is said, 'And in thy majesty be successful'. Read not וְהִרְרָךְ, 'and thy majesty', but וְהִדְרִיךְ, 'and thy sharpening' ".¹⁰⁵

(e) To Present a Maxim or Some Point of Doctrine

Two illustrations of this type of meaning will suffice: Hagiga 27a, where Resh Laqish states that the fire of Gehinnom has no power over the transgressors of Israel and introduces an al-tigre into the text of Song 4:3 to develop this idea; and the Mekhilta on Ex 18:27, where, à propos of Job 12:2,¹⁰⁶ an al-tigre is developed which permits the following observations: "As long as the wise man is alive, his wisdom is kept alive with him. As soon as the wise man dies, his wisdom is lost with him. Thus we find that when R. Nathan died, his wisdom was lost with him".¹⁰⁷

102 Qiddushin 30a. In this case the entire word has been changed.

103 Hagiga 14a.

104 Megilla 28b; cf. Nidda 73a.

105 Shabbath 63a. Other examples concerned with Torah and scholarship in general include Song 5:13 (Shabbath 30b; Pesahim 117a); Num 21:15 (Qiddushin 30b); Deut 8:9 (Ta'anith 4a); Deut 29:8 (Sanhedrin 99b); Is 53:13 (Berakoth 64a; Kerithoth 48b); Prov 8:36 ('Erubin 99a; Shabbath 114a); Deut 31:19 ('Erubin 54b).

106 Do not read תְּמוּת, "perfection", but תּוּמָה, "cessation".

107 The translation is that of J. Lauterbach, op. cit., Vol. 2, p.186.

(f) To Clarify Another Text of Scripture

By means of this device, the rabbis were able to increase the number of occasions whereby they were able to use one text of Scripture to illustrate another. As will be seen from some of the following examples, if it were not for the formula, some texts might not otherwise have been placed side by side. One of the earliest examples is present in the Mekhilta¹⁰⁸ à propos of Ps 78:25:

On the basis of this passage¹⁰⁹ R. Jose b. Simon used to say: The Israelites at that time were fattened like horses. For here it is said: 'Man did eat the bread of strong horses' (Ps 78:25). Furthermore, do not read 'of strong horses' ('Abirim), but 'of the limbs' ('Ebarim), that is, bread that is absorbed by the limbs. He said to them: This manna that you are eating will be absorbed in your limbs. 110

Although the al-tiqre traditions surrounding Josh 2:1 are later than the above example, they are worth recording here.¹¹¹ In Ruth Rabbah II,1 the text of 1 Chron 4:23, "These were the potters" is explained by references to Josh 2:1: "And Joshua, the son of Nun sent out of Shittim two spies secretly (שְׁחָרְיָ), saying ...". Three interpretations then follow:

R. Judah and R. Nehemiah: one said, They had carpenters' tools in their hands, (since it says) "spies, saying '(We are) carpenters' (שְׁחָרְיָ)". R. Nehemiah said, They had earthenware vessels in their hands, pretending to be potters (since it says) "saying, '(We are) potters' (שְׁחָרְיָ)". R. Simeon b. Yoḥai taught: The word is to be taken literally: Joshua said to them, "Make yourselves as mutes and you will discover their secrets". R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: By pretending to be mutes you will find out all about their affairs. 112

The Tanḥuma¹¹³ has an even more vivid exposition of the text:

108 Mekhilta at Ex 16:15. The essence of this tradition is present also in the Mekhilta of R. Simeon b. Yoḥai (cf. ed. Epstein and Melamed, op. cit., p.111), but without the actual formula. It is also present, with the formula, in a more developed way in Yoma 75b.

109 Ex 16:15b: "It is the bread which the LORD has given you to eat."

110 The translation is that of J. Lauterbach, op. cit., Vol. 2, p.114.

111 Ruth Rabbah II,1; Tanḥuma (Wilna and Buber editions) Shalah 1; Numbers Rabbah XVI,1.

112 The actual formula is not used here, but presupposed. See above, n.72. The translation is that of L. Rabinowitz, Midrash Rabbah, London 1961, Vol. 8, p.24.

113 Par. Shalah 1 (Wilna and Buber editions). This tradition is also included in Numbers Rabbah XVI,1, together with the formula, קרא בו חרש.

What is the meaning of the word "heresh"? It teaches that they provided themselves with pots and cried, "Here are pots, whoever wishes, let him come and buy!" Why all this trouble? That no one might detect them - reading the word heres (קרי ביה : חרס) - and that people should not say that they were spies ...

Other examples of one biblical verse complementing the interpretation of another by means of this formula include: Gen 2:4 (Is 26:4);¹¹⁴ 1 Sam 2:5 (Esther 5:11);¹¹⁵ 1 Kings 14:9 (Lev 19:26)¹¹⁶ and Esther 2:7 (2 Sam 12:3).¹¹⁷

(g) To "Elucidate" Historical Events or to "Characterise" Famous People

It is to be expected that commentary on the central biblical event, the Exodus, would be the source of some interpretations involving the al-tiqre device,¹¹⁸ and that the personality of Moses would be brought into greater relief in a similar way.¹¹⁹ Abraham's missionary zeal in causing the name of the Holy One, blessed be He, to be uttered by every passer-by is described by Resh Laqish in Soṭa 10a-b,¹²⁰ and in Megilla 28a, Abimelek's settlement with Sarah is associated with blindness.¹²¹ Joseph, instead of "being brought down (הורד) to Egypt,"¹²² "brings down" (הורד) Pharaoh's astrologers from their eminence, by means of the al-tiqre formula. Anecdotes concerning the killing of the Hebrew male children by the Egyptians cause an al-tiqre in the text of Ez 16:17.¹²³ David's piety in reciting Psalms 1 - 72 has already been described.¹²⁴ Solomon's identification of the "Evil Inclination" as "the Enemy" required an al-tiqre in the text of Prov 25:22,¹²⁵

114 Menahoth 29b.

115 Megilla 15b.

116 Berakoth 10b.

117 Megilla 13a.

118 Cf. Mekhilta at Ex 12:13 (see above, p.142); at Ex 14:22 (see above, p.145); at Ex 14:29 (see above, p.141); Ps 68:13 (Shabbath 88b).

119 Cf. Ex 32:1 (Shabbath 89a); Num 11:2 (see above, p.147).

120 Gen 21:33: Read not "and he called" but "and he made to call". Abraham's divine calling is linked with the work of creation in Genesis Rabbah II,3 (see above, n.36).

121 Gen 20:16: Read not "covering" but "blinding".

122 Gen 39:1 (Soṭa 13b).

123 Soṭa 11b.

124 See above, p.145.

125 Sukka 52a.

and a discussion as to whether Aḥaz should be included in the list of "up-right kings" required one in the text of Is 7:3.¹²⁶

(h) Anecdotes Concerning Contemporary Personalities

In Berakoth 20a, the story is told of R. Giddal's strength of character, that, although he was daily in circumstances of great temptation, he was in no way compromised. His explanation of this¹²⁷ required an al-tigre in the text of Gen 49:22.¹²⁸ Probably one of the best known of all the al-tigre formulae is that associated with Bar Kokhba (d. 135 A.D.), leader of the revolt in Judea against Rome (132-135 A.D.). His original name appears to have been Sim'on bar or ben Koseba (בן כוסבה, בר כוסבא), as the discoveries from the Wadi Murabba'at Caves testify.¹²⁹ While the name Bar Kokhba was to become the popular one, at least at the height of the revolt, contemporary letters found at Murabba'at show that his original name was retained in documents and letters. The messianic implications of the name Bar Kokhba are linked with Aqiba's interpretation of Num 24:17: "A star (כוכב) shall come out of David".¹³⁰ However, when defeat came, or perhaps even before, a derogatory, or at least, ambiguous twist was given to his original name, as witnessed to in Rabbi's interpretation of the verse by means of an al-tigre, "Read not כוכב, 'star', but כוזב, 'lie'".¹³¹ It is this version of his name which is recorded in the Talmud: Bar or Ben Kozeba (בן כוזבא, כוזיבא),¹³² which contains the punning allusion to a "lie",

126 PTal, Sanhedrin 27d.

127 I.e., he came from "The seed of Joseph, over whom the Evil Eye has no power" ... Read not עלי עין, 'by a fountain', but עולי עין, 'rising above (the power of) the eye'."

128 The same al-tigre is present in a shorter form in Berakoth 55b; Soṭa 36b; Baba Meṣi'a 84a and Baba Bathra 118b, in varying contexts of people immune from the "power of the Evil Eye".

129 Cf. P. Benoit, J.T. Milik and R. de Vaux, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert II. Les Grottes de Murabba'at, Oxford 1961, pp.124ff. Plate XXXV, B and C have good examples of letters concerning the renting of farmland, transactions which apparently required the authorisation of Sim'on Ben Koseba. The actual etymology of his patronym is not clear, but seems to be of Judaeo-Palestinian origin, cf. op. cit., p.126.

130 Lamentations Rabbah II,2. PTal, Ta'anith 68d. "When R. Aqiba beheld Bar Kozeba, he exclaimed, This is the King Messiah." (Lamentations Rabbah II,2).

131 The al-tigre itself is not present in the PTal, but in Lamentations Rabbah only.

132 Sanhedrin 93b; Baba Qamma 97b; PTal, Ta'anith 68d.

while Christian sources record βαρφαχέβας.¹³³ The actual al-tiqre formula is recorded only for Rabbi, but it is not clear whether Aqiba, or possibly his adversaries¹³⁴ actually used it in the initial messianic interpretation.

Other examples of the use of this formula to illustrate sayings about contemporary or semi-contemporary figures include Gen 25:23;¹³⁵ Is 43:4¹³⁶ and Eccles 8:10.¹³⁷

(i) Folklore

A small number of uses of the al-tiqre formula have to do with what can only be termed folklore. One such story¹³⁸ is developed through re-reading the word שברת, "thou has broken", in Ps 3:8 as שרבת, "thou has lengthened". In Berakoth 54b the story relates how the stone which Og, the King of Bashan, wanted to hurl at Israel, sank around his head because the Holy One, blessed be He, sent ants which bored a hole in it. He tried to pull it off, but his teeth projected on each side, thereby making it impossible to remove. Thus the text: "Thou has lengthened the teeth of the wicked" in its al-tiqre rendering is applied. The story ends on an equally folkloristic note: "The height of Moses was ten cubits. He took an axe ten cubits long, leapt ten cubits in the air, and struck him on his ankle and killed him". The story concerning the miraculous gates of Nicanor could also be placed in this category.¹³⁹

(j) Miscellaneous

Finally, some uses of the al-tiqre formula may be included here for reasons of literary skill, word-play and ingenuity. In Lev 23:40, the

133 Cf. Justin, Apologia 1,31: βαρφαχέβας (Migne, Vol. 6, Paris 1857, p.376); Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, IV, 6,2 (ed. J. Barty, SC, Paris 1952, p.165).

134 When Aqiba described Bar Kōṣeba as the King Messiah, R. Johanan b. Torta retorted: "Aqiba, grass will grow in your cheeks and he still will not have come!" (Lamentations Rabbah II,2; PTal, Ta'anith 68d).

135 Berakoth 57b; 'Aboda Zara 11a à propos of Antonius and Rabbi.

136 Berakoth 62b, à propos of R. Eleazar.

137 Gittin 56b à propos of some activities of Titus during the sacking of the Temple.

138 Berakoth 54b, à propos of Og, King of Bashan; cf. Megilla 15b and Soṭa 12b.

139 Yoma 38a, with an al-tiqre formula for the text of Song 1:17, do not read "cypresses" but "covenant of the sea"; see above n.62.

adjective הָדָר, "goodly", comes in for a number of alternative readings:¹⁴⁰ "Rabbi said: read not 'hadar' but 'ha-dir' (the stable); just as the stable contains large and small (animals), perfect and blemished ones, so also (the fruit spoken of)¹⁴¹ must have) large and small, perfect and blemished ... R. Abbahu said: read not: 'hadar' but 'ha-dar' (which dwells), a fruit which remains upon its tree from year to year. Ben Azzai said: read not 'hadar' but 'hudor', for, in Greek, water is called 'hudor'. Now what fruit is it that grows by every water? ..." ¹⁴² The calculations deriving from the al-tiqre in Ps 68:18¹⁴³ require some mathematical skill: "It may be said that He rides a light cherub and floats in eighteen thousand worlds, for it is said 'the chariots of God are myriads, even thousands, "shin'an".' Do not read "shin'an" (repeated) but "she-'enan" (that are not)!"¹⁴⁴

4. Those Hebrew Roots for which More than One al-Tiqre Formula is Attested

As can be seen from the above pages, there were many and varied ways in which the al-tiqre formula was used, thereby permitting a wide range of interpretation. One gets the impression that no word, apart from the Divine Name itself, was incapable of being used, so that the al-tiqre device had very few constraints on its use. Any noun, adjective, verb, pronoun or preposition was a potential candidate. What follows is a brief outline of those Hebrew roots mentioned above, concerning which more than one al-tiqre was used.¹⁴⁵

- (i) The root אָמַן, "to be faithful": Deut 32:20;¹⁴⁶ Is 26:2.¹⁴⁷
- (ii) The root בָּרַךְ, "to bless": Ex 23:25;¹⁴⁸ Prov 22:9.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁰ Sukka 35a.

¹⁴¹ Lev 23:40: "The fruit of a good tree".

¹⁴² This is a good illustration to show that these suggested readings were never intended as textual alternatives, but appear simply as a skilful play on words.

¹⁴³ 'Aboda Zara 3b.

¹⁴⁴ Twice ten thousand minus two thousand gives the figure of eighteen thousand.

¹⁴⁵ As stated above, p.140, this outline is not intended to be exhaustive, but attempts to give a general idea of the types most frequently found in the early Midrashim and Babylonian Talmud, with occasional references to the Jerusalem Talmud and some of the other later Midrashim.

¹⁴⁶ Siphre on Deuteronomy at 32:20. See above p.151.

¹⁴⁷ Shabbath 119b; cf. PTal, Shebi'ith 35c.

Firstly, the first five roots are very often connected with a religious or semi-religious context. The root כּנר reappears in three of the official tiqqune sopherim.¹⁷⁰ The root כּנר will be mentioned in a later section in the context of euphemisms;¹⁷¹ the root שּׁנא will be referred to in this same context.¹⁷²

Finally, the numerals appear to have been popular subjects for the use of al-tiqre. The word שנה, "year", is twice transformed into "two" in (viii) above, while the root שבע, "to be satisfied", is transformed into "seventy" once and "seven" twice in (ix) above. Other instances where numerals are involved include Ex 32:1;¹⁷³ Lev 25:21;¹⁷⁴ Deut 6:7¹⁷⁵ and Is 3:3.¹⁷⁶

5. Personalities to whom the Use of this Formula is Attributed

Of the different al-tiqre formulae mentioned in the foregoing pages, more than half of them cite some authority regarding the origin of the new reading. In some cases, where the same al-tiqre occurs in the same sense in two different passages, two separate personalities are credited with authorship.¹⁷⁷ This fact, together with the nature of midrashic traditions in general, must be borne in mind in the following attempt to situate the historial development of this device against the backdrop of the various groups of Tannaim¹⁷⁸ and Amoraim with whom the formula is associated.

The earliest group with which the formula is used is that of the younger group of the second generation of Tannaim (c. 110-130 A.D.), in

170 Hos 4:7; Jer 2:11; Ps 106:20. See above, pp.97-105.

171 See below, p.177f. and pp.191-195.

172 See below, pp.177f and 234ff.

173 Shabbath 89a: read not שש, "delayed", but שש באו, "the sixth (hour) had come".

174 Rosh Hashana 13b: read not לשלוש, "for three", but לשליש, "to a third".

175 Qiddushin 30a. See above, n.102.

176 Hagiga 14a. See above, n.103.

177 Cf. for instance, n.27 above; also Is 25:2: in Shabbath 119b it is Resh Laqish, in Sanhedrin 110b it is R. Meir.

178 Cf. H. Strack, Introduction, Ch. XIII, "The more important Teachers", pp.105-134, for the generation divisions.

particular with R. Aqiba¹⁷⁹ and with the school of R. Ishmael.¹⁸⁰ Of R. Aqiba's pupils in the third generation of Tannaim (c. 130-160 A.D.), the following have one or more al-tiqre formulae attributed to them: R. Meir;¹⁸¹ R. Judah ben Ilay¹⁸² and R. Jose b. Ḥalaphta,¹⁸³ while R. Ishmael's two most prominent pupils, R. Josiah¹⁸⁴ and R. Jonathan¹⁸⁵ likewise have the formula attributed to them. Also of this group, but in post-Hadrianic times, is Joshua ben Qarḥah.¹⁸⁶

In the fourth generation of Tannaim (c. 160-190 A.D.), the following names feature: R. Judah ha-Naši;¹⁸⁷ R. Isaac¹⁸⁸ and R. Eleazar ben Judah.¹⁸⁹ The fifth generation of Tannaim (c. 190-210 A.D.) is represented by R. Ḥiyya b. Abba¹⁹⁰ and Bar Qappara.¹⁹¹

In the first five generations of Amoraim there are over twenty different persons to whom the device of al-tiqre is attributed. Of these, two names in particular stand out, Joshua ben Levi¹⁹² of the first generation

179 R. Aqiba is directly credited with the alternative reading of Lev 20:13 (Siphra), see above, p.148, and appears to be indirectly responsible for some type of rereading of Num 24:11. See above, pp.156-157.

180 Presumably this term refers firstly to R. Josiah and R. Jonathan. The following are attributed anonymously to the school of Ishmael: Gen 1:1 (Sukka 49a); Lev 1:5 (Hullin 27a); Lev 11:43 (Yoma 39a). It is possible that the anonymous al-tiqre formulae in the Mekhilta come ultimately from R. Ishmael himself.

181 Ps 68:28 (Mekhilta at Ex 14:22); Ps 72:20 (Pesahim 117a); Esther 2:7 (Megilla 13a); Is 26:2 (Sanhedrin 110b).

182 Gen 2:4 (Menahoth 29b); Num 11:32 (Siphre Num); Ps 16:11 ('Arakin 13b; Pesiqta 179b).

183 Mekhilta at Ex 19:17 (à propos of Deut 33:2).

184 Ibid. at Ex 12:13 and 12:17.

185 Lev 25:21 (Rosh Hashana 13a-b).

186 Eccles 1:4 (Siphre Deut. at 11:21); Num 11:32 (Yoma 75b). See above, n.27.

187 Lev 23:40 (Sukka 35a); Num 24:17 (Lamentations Rabbah II,2).

188 Gen 20:16 (Megilla 28a); Ex 23:25 (Berakoth 48b); Is 11:9 (Baba Bathra 74b).

189 Lev 26:16 (Shabbath 32b).

190 Num 21:14 (Qiddushin 30b); Ps 68:36 (Zebahim 115b); Ps 94:12 (Berakoth 5a); Prov 8:36 (Shabbath 114a). In all but the first instance R. Ḥiyya is speaking in R. Joḥanan's name.

191 Deut 23:14 (Kethubboth 5a).

192 Ex 32:1 (Shabbath 89a); Ps 29:2 (Berakoth 30b); Ps 50:23 (Mo'ed Qaṭan 5a; Soṭa 5b); Ps 68:13 (Shabbath 88b); Prov 22:9 (Soṭa 38b).

(c.210-240 A.D.) and Rabbi Simeon ben Laqish (Resh Laqish)¹⁹³ of the second generation (c.250-280 A.D.).

If any conclusion may be drawn from this brief sketch of personalities to whom the use of this formula is attributed, it might be expressed as follows: throughout the generations of Tannaim and Amoraim there is evidence of the widespread use of this method of interpretation, recorded as early as the time of Aqiba and Ishmael, and still going strong at the time of R. Naḥman¹⁹⁴ of the fifth generation of Amoraim (c.350-400 A.D.). Various usages of the formula in the later Midrashim are not taken into account here.¹⁹⁵

6. Comparison between the Two Phenomena of Tiqqune Sopherim and al-Tiqre

Comparison between the types of tiqqune sopherim and types of al-tiqre permits a certain number of tentative conclusions regarding the relationship and possible interdependence of the two phenomena. The official list of scribal emendations may be reduced to the following types of correction (alleged or otherwise):

- (i) Metathesis of words in a sentence (Gen 18:22).
- (ii) Metathesis of letters within a word (2 Sam 20:1; 1 Kings 12:16; 2 Chron 10:16).
- (iii) Omission of a letter within a word (1 Sam 3:13; Job 7:20).
- (iv) Substitution of one word for another (Job 32:3).
- (v) Alteration of the verbal form from second person singular to first person plural (Hab 1:12).
- (vi) Alteration of a personal suffix to a noun from first to third person, etc. in relation to God (Zech 2:12; Ez 8:17; Hos 4:7; Jer 2:11; Ps 106:20; Mal 1:12,13; Lam 3:20; 2 Sam 16:12; Num 11:15); in relation to Moses (Num 12:12).

Apart from Num 12:12, a common denominator for all these "corrections" lies in the fact that they have for aim the safeguarding of God's honour. No such common denominator may be detected for the use of the al-tiqre formula.¹⁹⁶ In fact, they hardly touch on God,¹⁹⁷ and certainly attempt no

193 Gen 21:33 (Soṭa 10ab); Num 11:32 (Yoma 75b); Is 26:2 (Shabbath 119b); Ps 3:8 (Berakoth 54b; Megilla 15b; Soṭa 12b); Prov 8:36 ('Erubin 99a).

194 Ez 38:17 (Sanhedrin 17a; 'Arakin 10b); Hos 10:5 (Megilla 25b; Sanhedrin 63b).

195 Such as the reproduction of Midrash Shemuel on 1 Sam 8:7 in Yalqut Shimeoni Vol.2 par. 100 p.720 (Goldman's edition, Warsaw 1876). See below, pp.163-164 and nn.205-206.

"theological" emendation as such.

However, there are very definite points of comparison between some of the types of alterations listed here for the tiqqune scpherim and those described in the foregoing pages¹⁹⁸ for the al-tiqre device.

The case of Gen 18:22, with its proposed emendation for the place of the words, Yahweh and Abraham, in the phrase, has a distinct and clear structural parallel with the al-tiqre à propos of Eccles 1:4,¹⁹⁹ which is developed within the Siphre on Deuteronomy at 11:21. The proposed emendation concerning Gen 18:22 is recorded in traditions which are generally considered later than that of the Siphre on Deuteronomy.²⁰⁰ The personalities to whom the respective traditions are attributed are separated by some five generations, Joshua ben Qarḥah²⁰¹ for Eccles 1:4 and Simeon ben Pazzi for Gen 18:22. It might not therefore be totally rash to suggest that the earlier attested usage of the al-tiqre formula in the Siphre may in some way be related to the later tiqqun scpherim of Gen 18:22, at least as regards the type of alteration involved in both cases.

The parallel texts of 2 Sam 20:1; 1 Kings 12:16 and 2 Chron 10:16, with their proposed emendation involving metathesis of two letters in the word אהלי, "his tents" have a number of direct parallels among the al-tiqre types of rereading the biblical texts.²⁰² In the case of Num 11:32 two third-generation Tannaim are credited with formulating the al-tiqre readings, Judah ben Ilay²⁰³ and Joshua ben Qarḥah, which situates this tradition as early as 130-160 A.D., while for Ps 29:2, Joshua ben Levi, a century later, is considered the author of the al-tiqre there.

The sources recording the tiqqunim for the texts of 2 Sam 20:1 and

196 Although it has been possible to classify them to a reasonable extent into different groups of meaning, see above pp.144-155.

197 See above, n.69 and n.70, and p.147. See below, à propos of Num 13:31.

198 Cf. pp.139ff. above.

199 Cf. pp.143-4 above.

200 PTal, Bikkurim 65c; Genesis Rabbah XLIX,7; Midrash Tehillim at Ps.18.

201 Joshua ben Qarḥah belongs to the third generation of Tannaim, while Simeon ben Pazzi is numbered among the third generation of Amoraim.

202 See above, p.140. Cf. Siphre at Num 11:32 (cf. Yoma 75b); Ps 29:2 (Berakoth 30b); Ps 49:12 (Mo'ed Qaṭan 9b); Ps 68:18 ('Aboda Zara 3b).

203 Cf. W. Bacher, Die Agada der Tannaiten, Vol.2, p.208 n.5.

parallels are complex and in general late,²⁰⁴ but it is significant that an al-tiqre tradition for 1 Kings 12:16 is recorded in Yalqut Shime'oni²⁰⁵ and in one MS of Midrash Shemuel,²⁰⁶ in the name of Simeon ben Yoḥai (136-160 A.D.). This case is the clearest point of direct overlapping of the two phenomena, where the traditions record both a tiqqun and an al-tiqre for the same word.

Since it has already been demonstrated that the textual evidence for a genuine scribal emendation in 2 Sam 20:1, and parallels, is practically non-existent,²⁰⁷ it seems very likely that it may have been an original al-tiqre tradition à propos of 1 Kings 12:16, or possibly 2 Sam 20:1,²⁰⁸ together with the "theological" implications arising from the new reading, that set the wheels in motion towards the production, in time, of three fully fledged tiqqune sopherim.

The third type of tiqqun listed above consisted in the omission of a letter from the word in question; in the case of 1 Sam 3:13, of the letter aleph,²⁰⁹ and in Job 7:20, of the final kaph. In the foregoing pages,²¹⁰ similar al-tiqre types have been recorded, two with the omission of 'aleph.²¹¹ No conclusion other than the material similarity of the two procedures can be drawn in this instance, due to the absence of any significant factors associated with the al-tiqre usages in question.

The fourth type of tiqqun mentioned above consisted in the substitution of the name of Job for that of God (Job 32:3). No al-tiqre form parallel to this has been uncovered. The nearest material similarity is the case where one entire word took the place of another, "And you shall teach them diligently" has the following substituted form: "You shall divide into

204 See pp.85-91 above.

205 Cf. Goldman Edition, Warsaw 1876, Vol.2 par.106, p.270 at 1 Sam 8:7, which is essentially a reproduction of Midrash Shemuel at this point.

206 Buber's edition, 1893, does not contain the al-tiqre, but he notes that MS 563 (Parma) of de Rossi of this idrash does have the fuller text, parallel to Yalqut Shimeoni.

207 See above, p.86, n.133.

208 Since 2 Sam 20:1 already figures as a euphemism in the Mekhilta lists.

209 The omission of yodh, a mater lectionis, is not being considered.

210 See above, p.144f.

211 The letter 'aleph, being the weakest of the gutturals, is often omitted in the biblical text, without any significance being attached thereto.

three".²¹²

The fifth type of tiqqun listed above consisted in the alteration of the verbal form from second person singular to first person plural (Hab 1:12). No exact material parallel for this type of change has been found; perhaps the al-tiqre à propos of 1 Sam 2:2 could be cited as being somewhat parallel as regards the interpretation achieved through the new reading. In Hab 1:12 the supposed correction aims at avoiding the theologically inapt expression "Thou dost not die"; in 1 Sam 2:2 the new reading expresses the same idea more aptly: "There is none to survive thee."²¹³

Finally, the greater number of the tiqqune sopherim were created through a change in suffix, usually from the first person singular to the third person, singular or plural, to avoid having whatever the action or idea in question contain any reference to God. The nearest parallel to this group is found in Menahoth 53b²¹⁴ à propos of Num 13:31: "Do not read מִמֶּנּוּ, 'than we', but מִמֶּנּוּ, 'than He'." The context in which this al-tiqre occurs, and the interpretation resulting therefrom, could indeed have made a perfect tiqqun:²¹⁵

For R. Hinena b. Papa said: A greivous statement did the spies make at that moment when they said, 'For they are stronger than we'. Read not 'than we' but 'than He'; as it were, even²¹⁶ the Master of the House cannot remove His furniture from there.

Other examples of a change in suffix or personal pronoun are only material parallels,²¹⁷ and do not, therefore, imply any interpretation affecting God's honour and majesty. Their value lies in showing how easy it was to have a new interpretation by a simple change in vocalisation, or alteration of the personal suffix. It only required a suitable theological context then for the creation of a tiqqun.

This comparison of the two phenomena has, on the whole, been fruitful,

212 Deut 6:7 (Qiddushin 30a); see above, n.102.

213 Megilla 14a, attributed to R. Judah b. Menashia. See above, p.147.

214 This tradition is also present in Soṭa 35a.

215 In exactly the same way as described above for 1 Kings 12:16; see above p.163-164.

216 The statement that even God is powerless against the Amalekites, Hittites, Jebusites, Amorites and Canaanites would indeed have been blasphemous on the lips of the spies and would certainly have required an "emendation".

217 See above, p.146

for it has shown that there are definite points of overlapping between them. Moreover, both use some parallel methods in finding alternative readings. The above analysis has shown that the al-tiqre phenomenon is far wider in both nature and usage than the tiqqune sopherim phenomenon. It has also been shown that both phenomena came to birth in similar circles and were passed on in the same bodies of traditional literature, one as a matter of course, the other, with certain misgivings, in the form of lists. The tiqqune sopherim were first midrashic in origin and only later adopted into certain Masoretic traditions.

Yet, the tiqqune sopherim have other characteristics that will be better identified by comparison with the use of "euphemism" and other oblique or substitute expressions²¹⁸ in both Scripture and Midrashim, and by comparison with some of those instances in the biblical text²¹⁹ which show positive evidence of having been emended for theological motives, but which are not mentioned among the eighteen canonical tiqqune sopherim.

218 See below, Ch.5.

219 See below, Ch.6.

CHAPTER 5

DOES "EUPHEMISM EQUAL EMENDATION"? AN INVESTIGATION OF SOME USES
OF EUPHEMISM AND OTHER OBLIQUE OR SUBSTITUTE EXPRESSIONS IN THE
TALMUD, MIDRASHIM AND BIBLE

1. Preliminary Questions and Observations(a) The Terms Tiqqen/Tiqqun and Kinnah/Kinnuy as Referring to the Traditional Lists

Because the tiqqune sopherim are first attested and described as kinnuyim in the Siphre and Mekhilta traditions,¹ it is necessary at this point to investigate, in a broader context, the part played by "euphemism" as a literary and stylistic phenomenon in biblical and rabbinic literature. The use of the term "euphemism" in this and the following chapter is both broader and narrower than the strictly etymological definition of the word.² It is broader, in that it is extended to cover certain related phenomena, such as its logical counter-term, dysphemism, as well as other forms of oblique or substitute expressions. It is narrower, in that the focus or centre of interest in this study is on theological or semi-theological "euphemism", rather than on both sacred and profane euphemism. The verb kinnah, "to use a substitute", can refer to both euphemistic and dysphemistic substitution, and, as will be seen, is one term among others in the whole field of euphemism and oblique expression.

Some attempt has already been made to try to understand the relationship between the two terms, kinnah/kinnuy and tiqqen/tiqqun, when referring to the same entity, namely, the traditional lists of biblical passages which were "emended" by the scribes.³ When used in the context of these traditional lists, the terms kinnah/kinnuy may be taken as being, in a general sense, the equivalent of tiqqen/tiqqun. In this very restricted

1 See above, p.18, n.4 in particular, and pp.25-30.

2 The following definition of euphemism is taken from the article on "Euphemism" in JE, Vol.5, p.267 by S. Ehrenfeld: "A figure of speech by which a softened, indirect expression is substituted for a word or phrase offensive to delicate ears, though more accurately expressive of what is meant."

3 See above, pp.68-70.

context, then, and to the extent that the verb kinnah may be translated here as "to use a euphemism", a first equation, "euphemism equals emendation",⁴ may be tolerated, without prejudice to the actual authenticity or otherwise of any given case among the traditional lists.⁵

(b) The Broader Relationship between the Phenomenon of Tiqqune Sopherim and the Use of "Euphemism" in General

If the overlapping of the terms tiqqun and kinnuy is to be allowed only in this very restricted context of the traditional lists, nevertheless, there are other points of contact between the two, which may be responsible for some of the confusion and inconsistency found in studies related to the tiqqune sopherim.⁶ The tiqqune sopherim are traditionally presented as emendations for theological motives. Many euphemisms and other oblique or related expressions are used for this very same reason. This fact constitutes an initial point of contact, but also an initial cause for confusion. For the question then arises as to what stage in textual transmission was a given "euphemism" first used? Did it always form part of the "original" text and was it always expressed thus? Or did it form part of the "earliest attested text"? Or can it be shown to be the result of subsequent deliberate intervention which corrected the earlier text in accordance with the theological outlook of a later age? Questions such as these show, that, on the one hand, it would be an over-simplification and misleading to

4 The expression, "Euphemism = Emendation" is taken from R. Yaron's article "The Coptos Decree and 2 Sam XII 14", VT 9 (1959) p.89. Yaron holds that ever since Geiger and Ginsburg, it has been unhesitatingly accepted by scholars that euphemisms such as the one under discussion (2 Sam 12:14) are later emendations. He submits "that this equation, euphemism = emendation is unwarranted". One of the aims of this Ch. is to attempt to clarify when the equation is unwarranted and when it may be maintained.

5 See above, p.129.

6 One such confusion is caused by the extension of the term tiqqun sopherim to cover other phenomena, whether it be a genuine euphemism, a textual emendation or a conjecture. As already mentioned in the Introduction above, (p.15), and repeated in (c) below, throughout this study, the term tiqqun/e sopherim is reserved for the cases cited in the traditional lists only. A good illustration of the extended use of this term may be found in a recent publication by R. Gordis, The Book of Job, where he applies the term tiqqun sopherim equally to Job 1:5; 2:9; 7:20; 9:19,24, 35; 32:3; 1 Kings 21:13 and Hos 4:15, although the traditional lists only cite Job 7:20 and 32:3.

7 The various phases in the development of the Hebrew Text as outlined by the HOTTP Committee are presupposed here. See Preliminary Report, Vol. 1, Introduction, pp.VI-VII.

equate "euphemism" and "emendation", while on the other hand, there are definite points of contact between the two which make the equation valid in certain cases. Hence the need for a careful definition of terms in what follows.

(c) Definition of Terms

(i) Tiqqune/Kinnuye Sopherim. As already stated in the Introduction above,⁸ throughout this study, the term tiqqune sopherim is reserved for the traditional lists only, and the term tiqqun for any of the individual cases numbered among these lists. The justification for limiting the terms to these lists, and to the cases cited within them, is found within the tradition itself. The term is not used in any of the rabbinic and Masoretic sources other than as referring to this specific tradition. It would therefore be more confusing than helpful to extend the term indiscriminately to the other biblical verses, even if they have undergone an emendation similar in structure and motivation to those of the tiqqune sopherim which may be accepted as genuine. The terms kinnah and kinnuye sopherim, which are present in the earlier sources for the tradition and in certain Masoretic lists respectively,⁹ are likewise understood as referring to this same phenomenon when accompanying these lists. Some of the other contexts in which the terms kinnah and kinnuy appear will be examined further below.¹⁰

(ii) Kinnuy. This term appears in a number of other rabbinic contexts,¹¹ apart from those concerned with the traditional lists, and generally indicates some form of substitute expression. It can be identified as one term among others in the domain of "euphemism" and related expressions, and is more generic than the term tiqqun. The medieval commentators occa-

8 See above, p.15.

9 The term kinnuy is present in the following sources: the Siphre, Mekhilta and the three citations of these in the Yalqut Shime'oni, the Siphre Zutta and Midrash Haggadol, the Tanhuma and Yalqut ha-Makhiri, MS BM 1379, the Okhlah list, the list appended to the Diqduqe, the partial list in T.S.D. 1,61 and three of the Pugio Fidei lists, foll. 243, 548 and 669. The term kinnuye sopherim is present in the lists appended to the Diqduqe, and in a corrupt or emended (?) form in the T.S.D. list (see above, pp.45-46).

10 See below, nn.11-13.

11 See above, p.18, n.4, concerning the translation of this term. Cf. W. Bacher, Die exegetische Terminologie, Vol. 1, pp.83-85; J. Levy, op. cit., Vol. 2, pp.350-51. See below, p.175, nn.43-44.

sionally use this term, kinnuy, also, whether in the context of the traditional tiqqune sopherim¹² or otherwise.¹³

(iii) Original "Euphemism" (Sacred and Profane). In the following pages the term "original euphemism" will refer to any form of euphemistic or substitute expression¹⁴ which can be accepted with reasonable certitude as having formed part of the original text, congenital as it were with the rest of the passage. Such original or spontaneous¹⁵ "euphemisms" may be either sacred or profane in character or motivation, though it is not always possible or even wise to distinguish too rigidly in many cases. The lines of demarcation, between things pertaining to God and things pertaining to his chosen ones or his chosen people, are often blurred.¹⁶ And even in the case of "euphemisms" which appear to concern profane matters,¹⁷ the sense of delicacy which occasioned them was very often tied up with a theological perspective.¹⁸

(iv) Secondary "Euphemism" (Sacred or Profane). The term "secondary euphemism", by contrast with that of "original euphemism", is intended to cover the various instances whereby a later intervention deliberately altered the original text, so that the resulting text becomes a "euphemism" of one kind or another. As in the case of original euphemisms, secondary euphemisms may also be either of a sacred or profane nature, or a mixture. In fact, it is more likely that secondary euphemisms would have a theological motive, and consequently the line of demarcation is even more blurred. Secondary euphemism is a broad term, therefore, which covers various types of emendatory initiative, and, in this sense, it may be considered as parallel with those of the tiqqune sopherim which are genuine.

12 Cf. Rashi at Num 11:15; Ibn Ezra at Ps 106:20.

13 Cf. Ibn Ezra at Ps 106:20 à propos of 2 Sam 12:14; at Job 1:5 à propos of this verse and 1 Kings 21:13; Radaq at 1 Sam 20:16; 25:22; 29:4 (he uses the verb kinnah at 2 Sam 12:14); Rashi at 2 Sam 12:14 and Job 1:5 (he uses the verb kinnah at 1 Sam 20:16).

14 This includes those associated with the term kinnuy in (ii) above.

15 Spontaneous in the sense that through convention and repeated usage, a given "euphemism" or substitute expression becomes automatic, even though in earlier ages it may have been only partially used or not at all.

16 See below, p.183.

17 See below, p.178.

18 Indeed, one might add that it was through an over-developed sensitivity to euphemism that a certain number of false tiqqunim were created (cf. Ez 8:17; Mal 1:13). See below, p.182 and p.196.

It will not always be possible to ascertain in each case whether a given text is an instance of an "original" or a "secondary" euphemism, but it is hoped that a sufficient number of both can be identified in the pages which follow, as to warrant the distinction. In any case, it is imperative for the science of textual criticism to attempt to distinguish between the literary and stylistic features of a text and the hazards of textual transmission.

The remaining parts of this chapter will be concerned mainly with original euphemisms, whereas the following chapter will be concerned with secondary euphemisms, or, to use an alternative term, "theological corrections". Finally, by using this term "secondary" euphemism to designate a deliberate intervention to emend a given text for theological or semi-theological reasons, this is yet another sense in which the equation, "euphemism = emendation", is valid.¹⁹

2. Some Uses of Euphemism and Other Oblique or Substitute Expressions in Rabbinic Writings

This examination of the use of original euphemisms will begin with rabbinic writings, in particular with the Talmudim, and with occasional references to some of the Midrashim. There are two reasons for beginning thus, and working backwards into the Old Testament. Firstly, these rabbinic writings abound in the use of euphemistic idiom, so that it can be assumed that one is dealing almost exclusively with original or congenital euphemism. Euphemistic expression had become so much a way of thinking by this time that they expressed themselves naturally and spontaneously through the various forms which will be illustrated in some of the following paragraphs.²⁰ One can then reach further back into the earlier embryonic forms

¹⁹ See above, n.4.

²⁰ Cf. S. Ehrenfeld, "Euphemism" in JE, Vol.5, pp.267-68; B. Heller, "Euphemismus" in Encyclopaedia Judaica, Berlin 1930, Vol.6, pp.823-24; S.M. Paul - L.I. Rabinowitz, "Euphemism and Dysphemism" in EJ, Vol.6, pp.959-62; E. König, Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik in Bezug auf die Biblische Literatur (komparativisch), Leipzig 1900, pp.36-42. It is beyond the scope of this present study to investigate the nature and extent of targumic "euphemism" and the various anti-anthropomorphic devices present in the Targumim. The interested reader is referred to some of the following: B. Grossfeld, A Bibliography of Targumic Literature, Cincinnati-New York 1972 (Vol. 1, with 1045 entries) and 1977 (Vol. 2, with a further 767 entries); P. Nickels, Targum and New Testament, A Bibliography together with a New Testament Index, Rome 1969; J. Bowker, The Targums and Rabbinic Literature. An introduction to Jewish Interpretations of Scripture, Cambridge 1969; M. McNamara,

of these euphemisms in certain Old Testament passages, and see, if possible, whether, at their conception, they were part of the original text, or whether they were grafted on through textual surgery at a later stage.

The second reason for beginning thus with rabbinic literature is that this was approximately the same period when the tiqqune sopherim traditions were being developed and expanded. By filling out the background to the manifold use of "euphemism", it is not difficult to see how a tradition of tiqqune sopherim could have been developed, which included in it, instances which reflect this sensitivity to euphemism and other forms of substitute expressions.

The uses of original "euphemism" and oblique expression about to be examined here are of various kinds, some more explicitly theological in intent, and others more profane. The rationale behind the frequent use of euphemism and related phenomena in the Talmud and other similar literature may be deduced from sayings such as the following:

Joshua ben Levi said: One should not utter a gross expression with his mouth, for behold Scripture employs a circumlocution (Dpy) of eight letters rather than utter a gross expression. 21

The reference here is to Gen 7:2, "And of the beasts that are not clean". Instead of saying "unclean", the circumlocution necessitates the use of an additional eight letters. In Leviticus Rabbah XXVI,1, the same logion of R. Joshua is repeated, but this time the use of the circumlocution is attributed directly to God, "We find that the Holy One, blessed be He, used a circumlocution of eight words ..."22 A logion of R. Simeon ben Laqish

The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch, Second Printing with Supplement containing Additions and Corrections, (AnBibl 27a), Rome 1978; R. Le Déaut, "The Current State of Targumic Studies", BThB 4 (1974) 1-32; idem, Le Targum du Pentateuque, (SC), Paris 1978ff.; idem, "A propos d'une définition du midrash", Biblica 50 (1969) 395-413; idem, "Un phénomène spontané de l'herméneutique juive ancienne: 'le targumisme'", Biblica 52 (1971) 505-525; S. Maybaum, Die Anthropomorphien und Anthropopathien bei Onkelos und den spätern Targumim, Breslau 1870; M. Ginsburger, "Die Anthropomorphismen in den Thargumim", JPhTh 17 (1891) 262-80 and 430-58; D. Muñoz León, "Soluciones de los Targumim del Pentateuco a los antropomorfismos", EstB 28 (1969) 263-81; A.J. Brawer, "Substitution of Anthropomorphisms in Ancient Translations of the Bible", BetM 57 (1974) 161-93 (in Hebrew, with an English summary, pp.405-404); M. Klein, "The Preposition קדם ('Before'): A Pseudo-anti-anthropomorphism in the Targums", JThS 30 (1979) 502-507; A. Sperber, The Bible in Aramaic. Vol. IVB, The Targum and the Hebrew Bible, Leiden 1973 (cf. pp.37-41 and 193-98 in particular).

21 Pesahim 3a.

draws attention to a more profound reason for euphemism:

R. Simeon ben Laqish said, and so it was taught in the name of R. Jose: A man should never speak in such a way as to give an opening to Satan. R. Joseph said: What text proves this? Because it says, "We were almost like Sodom" (Is 1:9). What did the prophet reply to them? "Hear the word of the LORD, ye rulers of Sodom" (Is 1:10). 23

Thus, one should not utter ominous words and thereby invite disaster. Such a statement, and the various euphemisms²⁴ which are a reflection of its caution, draw attention to a strong belief in the power of ill-omened words to inflict misfortune. That this fear reaches far back into the world of the ancient near east is amply demonstrated in the studies of J. Hempel,²⁵ S.H. Blank²⁶ and H.C. Brichto,²⁷ to mention but a few, and will be referred to again when examining some of those passages in the Bible which reflect this fear.²⁸

A third logion should be sufficient to illustrate the most profound reason of all for euphemism, namely respect for God:

R. Ḥiyya b. Abba reported in the name of R. Johanan, "It is better that one letter should be uprooted from the Torah, than that the Name of names be publicly profaned." 29

The following groupings or types of original "euphemisms" are not exhaustive, but should illustrate some examples which will be of interest for purposes of comparison, on the one hand, with the tiqqune sopherim, and on the other hand, with theological corrections or secondary euphemisms.

(i) Avoidance of the Direct Implication of the Speaker or Other Types of Oblique Expression

Typical examples of this type of euphemistic form include the use of the third personal pronoun instead of the first:

22 Cf. also Numbers Rabbah XIX,2 for yet another citation of this logion. See also Megilla 25b for further instances of the use of delicate expressions in place of indelicate ones.

23 Berakoth 19a. This same logion is repeated in Berakoth 60a and Kethubboth 8b.

24 See below, pp.174ff.

25 "Die israelitischen Anschauung von Segen und Fluch im Lichte altorientalischer Parallelen", ZDMG 4 (1925) 20-110.

26 "The Curse, Blasphemy, the Spell and the Oath", HUCA 23 (1950-51) 73-95.

27 The Problem of "Curse" in the Hebrew Bible, Pennsylvania 1963.

28 See below, pp.179ff.

29 Yebamoth 79a.

When the sons of R. Ishmael died ... R. Ishmael opened the conversation and said, "His sins were many, his sorrowful bereavements came in close succession, he troubled his masters once and a second time." 30

Also attested is the practice of using the phrase, "that man"³¹ in place of the speaker³² or in place of the person addressed.³³ In these different examples the underlying motivation for the substitution would seem to be linked with the logion of R. Simeon b. Laqish quoted above,³⁴ and in some way also reflected in the following:

R. Abba b. Kahana said, "It is like a man who curses himself, and hangs the curse on someone else." 35

Finally, this idiom has its parallel in St. Paul's account of his visions and revelations in 2 Cor 12:1-2ff.:³⁶

I know a man in Christ ... and I know that this man was caught up into Paradise ... on behalf of this man I will boast, but on my own behalf I will not boast...

where his use of the oblique form appears to have its roots in modesty rather than in the avoidance of evil repercussions.

(ii) Substitutes for the Name of God and Other Measures to Protect Divine Transcendence

Respect for the divine Name in the Talmud and similar literature may be examined from two angles. On the one hand, there are the prohibitions concerning the use of the divine biblical names,³⁷ and on the other

30 Mo'ed Qaṭan 28b. The four words underscored in the above passage would have been in the first person if an oblique expression had not been used. Cf. also Megilla 15b. In Megilla 15a there is reference to the introduction of euphemisms into the passage dealing with forbidden marriages, the third person being used in place of the second.

31 See below, pp.179-181 for two biblical parallels, Num 16:14 and 1 Sam 29:4.

32 Cf. Ḥagiga 15a; Sanhedrin 95b; Kethubboth 49b.

33 Cf. Sukka 48b; Giṭṭin 56b and 57a.

34 See above, n.23.

35 Sota 11a; cf. Sanhedrin 106a and Exodus Rabbah I,9. This logion is uttered in each case in the context of identifying a kinnuy in the biblical text at Ex 1:10.

36 Cf. H.L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, Munich 1922-28, Vol.3, pp.530-31.

37 The prohibitions concern the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton, and the committing of the names of God to secular writing (since any paper, other than the sacred writings, upon which that name appears might be discarded and thus "erased"). Cf. Shebu'oth 35a-b, concerning the divine names which may not be erased (i.e. they are sacred). Along with the Tetra-

hand, there are the additional names evolved by the rabbis, which consist of various references to his attributes³⁸. The most common of these additional names is "The Holy One, blessed be He".³⁹ Also important, particularly as an introduction to prayer is "Sovereign of the Universe",⁴⁰ while Ha-Maqom (the Place) is a very frequently used and deeply theological name.⁴¹ Ha-Shem likewise appears regularly.⁴²

This practice of using alternative or substitute⁴³ names for God is an excellent illustration of "original" euphemism or substitute expression, and it becomes particularly evident in those passages which deal with the taking of oaths,⁴⁴ or in the examination of witnesses in the trial of a blasphemer:⁴⁵

The whole day of the trial the witnesses are examined by means of a substitute (בכנוי) for the divine Name, thus, "May Jose smite Jose".⁴⁶ When the trial was finished, the accused was not executed on this evidence, but all the persons were removed (from the court), and the chief witness was told, "State literally what you heard." Thereupon he did so. The judges then arose and rent their garments, which rent was not to be resewn ...

grammaton, the list includes El, Eloha, Elohim, I am who I am, Aleph-Daleth, Yodh-He, Shaddai, Seba'oth.

38 Cf. L.I. Rabinowitz, "The Names of God" in EJ, Vol.7, pp.682-84.

39 הק"ו ברוך הוא, or more commonly הק"ו.

40 רבנו של עולם.

41 Cf. Genesis Rabbah LXVIII,9: "Rab Huna said in R. Ammi's name, Why do we give a changed name to the Holy One, blessed be He, and call him 'The Place'? Because he is the Place of the world (i.e. the world is contained in him but not he in the world)."

42 Other such additional names include "The All-Merciful", "Heaven", "Peace", and "I" ('Ani). In the case of the last mentioned name, cf. Sukka 53a, where tradition reports the following prayer of Hillel the Elder: "If I (אני) am here, everyone is here, but if I am not here, who is here?", (where all the personal pronouns in the passage refer to the divine presence).

43 The term used to describe this alternative name is kinnuy.

44 Cf. Shebu'oth 35a-b. Here again, the term used for "substitutes for the Name" is kinnuy. This same term is also found in Nedarim 2a-b, in discussion how substitutes for vows (kinnuye nedarim) have the validity of vows.

45 Sanhedrin 56a.

46 The word "Jose" is chosen as a substitute because it contains four letters, like the acutal Tetragrammaton, which must have been used by the blasphemer for him to be punished. Cf. J. Levy, op. cit., Vol. 2, pp.350f.

Other euphemistic strategies which protect divine transcendence include the following:

- (a) "Why was he called Nimrod? Because in his reign he led all the world in rebellion against himself (i.e. against God)." ⁴⁷
- (b) "Why does the text state, With their backs towards the temple of the LORD? It teaches that they uncovered themselves and committed a nuisance towards that which is below." ⁴⁸
- (c) "Through the slothfulness in which Israel indulged, not busy-ing themselves with the Torah, the enemy of the Holy One, blessed be He, became poor." ⁴⁹

The third expression above, the enemy/enemies of, occurs very frequently in relation to Israel, the scholars, and the wise men, and will be examined in greater detail in the following paragraph.

(iii) The Expressions, "the Enemies of" and "the Haters of", as Euphemistic Devices

As a euphemistic device, this expression appears quite frequently in talmudic and similar literature. Its use in the Bible ⁵⁰ will be looked at further below, but as it occurs in the Talmud, etc., it can be safely assumed to be an original "euphemism", an expression which had now become almost stereotyped through frequent use. Some examples should be sufficient to illustrate its scope and purpose. ⁵¹ In a discussion on the appropriate times for saying the various prescribed prayers, the following remark is made: "Destruction comes upon the enemies of Israel because they put off till late the times of the appointed seasons in Jerusalem." ⁵² Knowledge of the Torah can be acquired only in association with others, for R. Jose b. Hanina has said:

A sword is upon the enemies of the disciples of the wise who sit separately and study the Torah. What is more, they become stupid. ⁵³

⁴⁷ 'Erubin 53a. The reference is to Amraphel (Gen 14:1), and to a discussion between Rab and Shemuel as to whether he was called Amraphel or Nimrod.

⁴⁸ Yoma 77a. The text which is thus interpreted is that of Ez 8:16, which immediately precedes the tiqqun of Ez 8:17. It has already been suggested above that the euphemism, which is read into the text here in 8:16, probably helped to create a tiqqun in the following verse. See above, pp.93ff. The euphemism, "that which is below", refers to Heaven. which in turn, was one of those substitute names for God; see above, n.42

⁴⁹ Megilla 11a and Ta'anith 7b.

⁵⁰ See below, pp.183-191.

⁵¹ In the examples and references which follow, no explicit distinction will be made between אֵיבִי or שׂוֹנְאִי. Both forms achieved the same objective.

⁵² Berakoth 28a.

Another admonition related to the proper study of the Torah is expressed as follows:

Woe unto the enemies of the scholars who occupy themselves with the Torah, but have no fear of Heaven. 54

The greater majority of the uses of this idiom in Talmud and Midrashim are concerned with the protection of Israel.⁵⁵ The purpose of this "euphemism" would seem to be directly linked with the fear of "opening one's mouth to Satan",⁵⁶ and all that that logion conjures up in terms of the efficacy of the spoken word and the dangers inherent in placing threatening or pejorative words side by side with either God, Israel, or anyone else, deemed worthy of esteem. The same is true for the next euphemism to be examined, that of "bless" expressed in place of "curse".

(iv) The Expression, "to Bless" in Place of "to Curse"

Three instances of this idiom are singled out for illustration of how this euphemism appears as an accepted literary expression in the Talmud.⁵⁷ The first passage, Sanhedrin 56a, has already been referred to above for its reference to kinnuyim for the divine Name in the examination of witnesses in the trial of a blasphemer.⁵⁸ Throughout this passage, the verb "to bless" occurs in place of "to curse", as for instance: "(The blasphemer is not punished) unless he blesses the Name by the Name." In a discussion concerning various instances of excommunication,⁵⁹ the following observation occurs:

On that day they brought all the things that R. Eleazar had declared clean and burned them before him, and in the end they blessed him."

53 Berakoth 63b. The same idea is also found in Makkoth 10a and Ta'anith 7a. In all three texts, the "euphemism" is intended to avoid the appearance of drawing down a curse on the scholars, while nevertheless making a necessary point.

54 Yoma 72b.

55 See also Berakoth 32a; Yoma 72b; 75b; 77a; Sukka 29a; 52a; 52b; Beša 25b; Shabbath 33a; Ta'anith 7a-b; Megilla 12a; 12b; Mo'ed Qaṭan 9a; Sanhedrin 93a; 96a; 105b; 'Aboda Zara 4b; PTal, Ḥagiga 77d; Sanhedrin 23c; Exodus Rabbah XXXV,4; Numbers Rabbah V,7; X,1.

56 See above, n.23f.

57 See below, pp.191ff., for the examination of this same idiom in certain biblical verses. Other talmudic references include Yebamoth 101a; Sanhedrin 46a.

58 See above, nn.45-46.

59 Berakoth 19a; see also Baba Meši'a 59b for the same usage.

Finally, concerning the interpretation of certain biblical passages,⁶⁰ the following phrase occurs in Ḥagiga 11b:

These, therefore, must be required to make Gentiles subject to the prohibition concerning the blessing of God and idolatry, like the Israelites.

The motivation underlying this euphemism is closely linked with that observed in the case of the foregoing examples.

(v) Delicacy in the Use of Terms Referring to Death, Sickness and Other Infirmities

For the sake of completeness in examining the use of euphemism and related phenomena in the Talmud and similar literature, the remaining types will be briefly referred to, since they are of less direct relevance in a study concerned with the "Tiqqune Sopherim and Other Theological Corrections" in the biblical text. Various euphemisms occur for "dying" and "death". "Departure"⁶¹ is a common term, as well as "to be at rest".⁶² Various forms of sickness are also softened by the use of euphemism. Of particular interest is the use of "having much light" or "seeing much" as a euphemism for blindness.⁶³

(vi) Euphemisms for Various Aspects of Sexuality and Other Bodily Organs or Functions

The use of euphemism in these areas in the Talmud, and to a lesser extent in the Bible before it, is so well developed and so frequent, that it certainly accounts for more than half the entire instances of euphemism in rabbinic literature.⁶⁴ Again, since these uses are not of direct relevance for this study, they are only mentioned here for the sake of completeness and because of their abundance. They, too, are an excellent illustration of the spontaneous use of original euphemism mentioned above.⁶⁵

60 Lev 24:15 and 20:2.

61 Baba Bathra 16b; Berakoth 61b; Shabbath 88b.

62 Shabbath 30b; Mo'ed Qaṭan 25a.

63 Cf. Ḥagiga 5b; Baba Meṣi'a 78b. See J. Levy, *op. cit.*, Vol.3, p.205; T. Nöldeke, Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft, Strassburg 1910, pp.88ff.; the latter gives some interesting parallel uses of euphemisms for blindness in Arabic and Syriac.

64 For further details, cf. E. Künig, *op. cit.*, pp.36-42; S. Ehrenfeld, *op. cit.*, pp.267-68; S.M. Paul - L.I. Rabinowitz, *op. cit.*, pp.960-62; see also Megilla 25a-b.

65 See above, n.15 and see below, pp.194-95.

3. Some Uses of Euphemism and Other Oblique or Substitute Expressions and Some Problems Raised Thereby for Textual Criticism

The following paragraphs will be devoted to an examination of certain euphemistic and related forms in the biblical text. To the extent that it is possible to determine, an attempt will be made to see whether these cases of euphemism are "original" to the biblical text, or whether they were imposed upon it at a later stage through deliberate intervention. In other words, the question will be raised again for certain of these cases "Does euphemism equal emendation"?⁶⁶ As will be seen, it will not be easy to answer this question with the same certitude for each case. In order to facilitate comparison between the later talmudic and midrashic idiom and the biblical text, the groupings used above for the former,⁶⁷ will be retained, for the most part, in what follows.

(i) Avoidance of the Direct Implication of the Speaker Or Other Types of Oblique Expression

There are at least two examples of this type of euphemistic expression present in the biblical text, Num 16:14 and 1 Sam 29:4.⁶⁸ In both cases, the expression הָאֵלֶּים הַהֵם, "those men" appears to stand for the first person plural, us/our. In the case of Num 16:14, the context is concerned with the refusal of Dathan and Abiram to obey Moses' summons. Their reply, in terms of a very emphatic refusal,⁶⁹ is expressed in vv.13-14 in the first person plural throughout, and at the end of v.14, "Should you put out the eyes of these men, we will not come up" can be interpreted without difficulty as "Should you put out our eyes, we will not come up".

This is how Rashi interprets it in his commentary in loco,⁷⁰ and then says, "This is as when a man hangs his curse on his neighbour".⁷¹ Ibn Ezra cites a number of interpretations of this verse, among them that held by Rashi, but appears to settle for identifying "these men" as "the elders

66 See above, n.4.

67 See above, pp.173-178.

68 See above, pp.173-74 for examples from the Talmud, etc.

69 "We will not come up" is found in an emphatic position at the end of vv.12 and 14.

70 "Even if you put out our eyes, we will not go up".

71 See above, n.35, concerning references for this logion of R. Abba b. Kahana to which Rashi is alluding.

who were with Moses."⁷² This verse has already been mentioned above,⁷³ as featuring among the "eighteen" tiqqune sopherim in the treatment of this tradition by al-Qirqisani. The fact that al-Qirqisani gives "thine eyes" as the original reading for this case in his initial list, but then omits any further treatment of Num 16:14 in the following chapter, where he discusses in some detail each of the other seventeen cases, shows that he must not have been very clear on how Num 16:14 was a tiqqun.⁷⁴ Moreover, H. Hirschfeld, in his essay on Qirqisani's Introduction to the Pentateuch,⁷⁵ in summarising the main features of this Introduction, includes Num 16:14 among those expressions which are circumscribed "in order to preserve the hearer from unpleasant expressions".⁷⁶ It is possible that the alternation between the terms of tiqqun and kinnuy within the tradition of the tiqqune sopherim⁷⁷ may have been responsible for al-Qirqisani's inclusion of Num 16:14 among his "eighteen". His name may be included among those who regard Num 16:14 as a form of "euphemistic" expression.⁷⁸

From the point of view of the text, this verse presents no problem. The MT is well attested and reinforced by the LXX textual witnesses. The fact that both Vulgate and Syriac interpret the oblique expression in translating,⁷⁹ is therefore all the more interesting. They confirm in their own way that awareness of the existence of a "euphemism" here is not a medieval invention, and their having made the necessary adaptation and

72 Japhet ben 'Eli in his commentary in loco also gives a number of interpretations for this verse, but not the one mentioned by Rashi. He does, however, recognise 1 Sam 29:4 as a genuine "euphemism", see below, p.195.

73 See above, pp.39-42, and p.55 for details.

74 See above, p.40, n.71

75 H. Hirschfeld, Qirqisani Studies, London 1918, p.30.

76 He resumes al-Qirqisani's thought as follows: "This is as if a person who is the subject of another person's imputations would say that this individual accuses, abuses and curses himself. By this means he rids himself of the idea that he is accused or abused or cursed."

77 See above, p.129 and p.168.

78 Abulwalid may also be included, for he lists Num 16:14 among the references he groups in Ch.27, "Concerning the use of words in an improper sense" of his grammar. Cf. M. Metzger, Le Livre des Parterres Fleuris d'Aboul-Walid Merwan Ibn Djanah, traduit en français sur les manuscripts arabes, Paris 1889, p.290.

79 "An et oculos nostros vis eruere? Non venimus" is the Vulgate rendering, which is similarly translated by the Syriac. The Targum and Arabic Versions follow the MT.

adjustment in translating shows that they understood the sense of the idiom.⁸⁰ Their readings cannot be claimed as real textual variants, so that for this case the equation "euphemism = emendation" is not valid.⁸¹ It constitutes a good instance of original "euphemism" in the biblical text.

1 Sam 29:4 may also be considered in this light. Achish, the Gittite, is trying to pass off David and his men as loyal followers of the Philistines, in reply to a query from the Philistine commanders: "What are these Hebrews doing here?" The Philistines are not taken in by Achish's recommendation, but request that David and his men be sent home, "For how could this fellow reconcile himself to his lord? Would it not be with the heads of these men?" (= our heads).

1 Chron 12:19 constitutes a type of midrashic retelling of this event, in which the oblique expression of the Samuel text is clearly spelled out:

Yet he (= David) did not help them, for the rulers of the Philistines took counsel and sent him away, saying, "At peril to our heads he will desert to his master Saul".⁸²

In this case, too, the Vulgate and Syriac, like the text of 1 Chron 12:19, interpret the "euphemism" of the Samuel text;⁸³ and here too there is a solid tradition for the "euphemistic" interpretation of this verse among personalities such as Japhet ben Eli,⁸⁴ Abulwalid⁸⁵ and Radaq.⁸⁶ 1 Sam 29:4 may be accepted as another "euphemism", original in character, and

80 Cf. Factor 6 as used by the HOTTP Committee, p.XIf. of Introduction to Vol. 1.

81 See above, n.4.

82 The LXX tradition (except for the minuscules be₂) attests "the heads of these men", an example of how the LXX tradition for Chronicles was influenced by the LXX of Samuel.

83 The Vulgate rendering is "nisi in capitibus nostris". It is similarly translated by the Syriac (singular) and with a paraphrase to the same effect by the Arabic. The LXX and Targum reproduce the MT literally. See above, nn.79-80.

84 In his commentary in loco. He quotes the 1 Chron 12:19 text as evidence for a "euphemism" in the Samuel text.

85 In his Grammar, Ch. 27. See above, n.78.

86 In his commentary in loco. He says that "Those men is a kinnyu in place of themselves". On the use of kinnyu as a technical term, see above pp.167 ff.

once again, the equation "euphemism = emendation" does not apply.⁸⁷

(ii) Substitutes for the Name of God and Other Measures to Protect Divine Transcendence

Under this heading a certain number of biblical texts may be examined. In the OT, the expression "The glory of the LORD" occurs thirty-two times,⁸⁸ and usually designates God as he reveals himself in majesty and power. It occurs frequently in those passages of the Pentateuch which describe a theophany at Mt. Sinai or en route to Israel.⁸⁹ Awareness of divine presence is often described as "The glory of the LORD filled the house of the LORD" (1 Kings 8:11) or "The whole earth is filled with his glory" (Is 6:3).⁹⁰ Ezekiel uses this phrase quite frequently in describing his visions.⁹¹ For him "The glory of the LORD" can "stand" (3:23), "rise up" (10:4), "go out" (10:18), "go up" (11:23) and generally act in a way that suggests that "glory" is more than an abstract term. It is "the Glory" that sends the prophet Zechariah to the nations (Zech 2:12). It would be inaccurate to describe this use of "glory" when it designates God in his power and presence, as a euphemism, yet one can sense, in the development of its use, the beginnings of a theological awareness that was to find ample expression in the Targums.⁹²

It has already been suggested that, in both Jer 2:11 and Psalm 106:20, the use of "their glory" is basically euphemistic.⁹³ Rather than say

87 Among modern commentators only a trace of this tradition is found in the translation of H.J. Stoebe, *op. cit.*, p.497: "als mit den Köpfen unserer Männer (wörtlich "jener Männer")."

88 "The glory of the God of Israel" occurs four times, and glory with a suffix relating to God occurs equally often.

89 Cf. Ex 24:1,17; see also Ex 16:7,10; Lev 9:6,23; Num 14:21-22; 16:19; 17:7; 20:6.

90 Cf. Ex 40:34-5; Ez 43:5; 44:4; 2 Chron 7:1.

91 In 1:28, one can sense his difficulty in trying to find appropriate words: "Such was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the LORD". Cf. also 3:12; 43:2.

92 The term "glory" is often inserted in the Targums for theological motives. One of the clearest illustrations of this development may be found at Ex 24:10, where "They saw the God of Israel" (MT) becomes in Neofiti: "They saw the glory of the Shekinah of the LORD", and in Onqelos is rendered as "They saw the glory of the God of Israel".

93 See above, pp.104ff.

explicitly that Israel had forsaken her God, these texts euphemistically declare that "They have exchanged their Glory" (i.e. God).⁹⁴ One can conclude, therefore, with a certain measure of confidence, that here too, in spite of the tiqqun traditions associated with Jer 2:11 and Ps 106:20,⁹⁵ "Euphemism does not equal emendation."

A similar type of study of the development of the use of Name in relation to God in the OT⁹⁶ could provide some interesting examples of how, with the passage of time and a more sophisticated understanding of the transcendence of God, the word Name could suffice to designate God.⁹⁷ In other words, one would find traces already within the Bible, of that tendency which was to culminate with the rabbinic usage of simply referring to God as "the Name". In this sense one could see such biblical texts as "original euphemisms", aiming at preserving the utmost respect for God.

(iii) The Expression, "the Enemies of", as a Euphemistic Device

The formula "the enemies of" or "the haters of" occurs quite frequently in talmudic and midrashic literature as a euphemistic device,⁹⁸ and the ease with which it is used there suggests that, by this period, it was a stereotyped idiom or original euphemism. The construct plural form, "the enemies of", occurs thirteen times in the OT. Of these, examination of the context shows that it is a perfectly normal plural construct which means

94 The citation of Ps 106:20 in Rom 1:23: "And they exchanged the glory of the Immortal God" is an indication that Paul was in contact with traditions which interpreted this euphemism.

95 Perhaps, because of the fact that the tiqqunim traditions were first handed down as kinnuyim, and, just as al-Qirqisani included a true "euphemism" (Num 16:14) to complete his list, so too, but at a much earlier stage, Jer 2:11 and Ps 106:20 were included as kinnuyim (which they were), and were thereby destined to gain tiqqun status when these traditions were further developed and expanded.

96 Cf. H. Cazelles, "Nom" in VThB (1970) 827-30.

97 Lev 24:11-16, which is a late text in pentateuchal traditions, is a good example in a context of blaspheming, parallel in theme to the passage in Sanhedrin 56a (see above, p.175): "and the Israelite woman's son blasphemed the Name, ..."; See also Deut 28:58.

98 See above, pp.176ff. An examination of the biblical usage of this idiom will be confined to "the enemies of", as "the haters of" does not appear to have been similarly used in the Bible.

exactly what it says in ten cases.⁹⁹ The remaining three occurrences will now be examined to see to what extent they are "euphemistic" in intent, and to determine, if possible, whether these "euphemisms" were original in the text, or whether they were deliberately introduced into it at a later period for theological motives. Two of them occur in the context of an oath (1 Sam 20:16 and 25:22) and have to do with "the enemies of David",¹⁰⁰ while the third, 2 Sam 12:14, is concerned with "scorning the enemies of the LORD". This third instance will be examined first.

1^o 2 Samuel 12:14. This verse forms part of the LORD's judgment on David because of his affair with Bathsheba and its consequences. The prophet Nathan rounds off the judgment with the following words:

Nevertheless, because by this deed, you have utterly scorned the enemies of the LORD, the child that is born to you shall die.

This MT rendering Ginsburg unhesitatingly terms as "nonsense".¹⁰¹ Like Geiger before him,¹⁰² and the majority of commentators¹⁰³ after him, Ginsburg classifies the words "the enemies of" as a "Sopheric alteration" inserted into the text "to mitigate the harsh and impious expressions towards the Almighty".¹⁰⁴ The original text, according to these commentators, is "Because you have utterly scorned the LORD".

There is, on the other hand, however, a small number of modern writers who maintain that this expression in 2 Sam 12:14 is a euphemism, original to

99 Cf. 1 Sam 18:25; 20:15; 29:8; 30:26; 2 Sam 18:32; Ps 37:20; 45:6; Mic 7:6; Esth 9:1; 2 Chron 20:29.

100 See above, p.170. This same blurring of the distinction between God and his especially favoured ones is also found in the tiqqune sopherim traditions, in that Num 12:12 has to do with preserving respect for Moses. See also below, pp.225ff.

101 Introduction, p.365.

102 Op. cit., p.267.

103 Cf. J. Wellhausen, op. cit., p.84; S.R. Driver, op. cit., p.225; K. Budde, The Books of Samuel in Hebrew, p.267; Die Bücher Samuel, p.256; W. Nowack, op. cit., p.196; P. Dhorme, op. cit., p.360; H.P. Smith, op. cit., p.324; A. Schulz, op. cit., p.133; K. Leimbach, op. cit., J. A. Maynard, "Samuel" in Bible du Centenaire, Paris 1947, Vol. 2, p.156. See also the position argued by E. Kbnig, Stilistik, p.41

104 Op. cit., p.363.

the author or Verfasser, and not a later insertion.¹⁰⁵ Of these, the case made by R. Yaron, defending 2 Sam 12:14 as an original euphemism, deserves special attention, because he identifies a similar usage of this euphemism in an Egyptian inscription which predates the books of Samuel by a number of centuries. He refers to line six and the following lines of the Coptos Decree of the 13th dynasty (18th c. B.C.) which reads as follows:¹⁰⁶

His name shall not be remembered in this temple,
according as is done toward one like him,
who is hostile toward the enemies of his god.

Yaron points out that J.H. Breasted already remarked on the unusual form contained here, but not understanding it, was content to describe the meaning as "uncertain".¹⁰⁷ Yaron consequently argues that this expression in 2 Sam 12:14 is a genuine euphemism, which formed part of the original text; and he then proceeds to identify other such euphemisms.¹⁰⁸ The possibility that this euphemistic device was already in use long before the composition of the books of Samuel would appear to be an overwhelming argument in support of this minority view that would see in this passage an original rather than a secondary euphemism.¹⁰⁹

That the enemies of in this verse is "euphemistic" is beyond doubt, and agreed upon by all the above mentioned commentators. The crucial and delicate question remains: at what stage in the textual history of this verse was it introduced? Or did it form an integral part of the verse from the beginning?

105 A Ehrlich, Randglossen, Vol. 4, p.299; R. Yaron, "The Coptos Decree and 2 Sam XII 14", VT 9 (1959) 89-91; cf. H.J. Stoebe, op. cit., p.448, for 1 Sam 25:22, who maintains that this idiom here is original (see below, n.124).

106 Cf. J.H. Breasted, Ancient Records of Egypt, Historical Documents from the earliest times to the Persian Conquest, 5 Volumes, New York 1905, Vol. 1, pp.340-41.

107 Op. cit., p.431, note b: "There are no difficulties of lexicon or grammar in this clause, but the meaning when rendered is uncertain."

108 1 Kings 21:10,13; Job 1:5,11; 2:5,9. These cases will be examined in the next sub-section below, pp.181-195. Yaron rightly calls for a more conservative approach to the question of editorial changes in the biblical texts (presumably more conservative than Geiger and Ginsburg and their followers). His submission "that euphemism = emendation is unwarranted" (p.89) has been referred to a number of times in the course of this chapter; see above, n.4.

109 For the precise meaning given to these terms in this study, see above pp.167 ff.

That the medieval commentators call this verse a kinnuy¹¹⁰ does not help one way or the other, since they also use this term both in relation to other types of original euphemisms¹¹¹ and to some of the tiqqune soph-erim¹¹² on the one hand, and on the other, they too would have been familiar with this formula as an original euphemism from its frequent use in the Talmud, etc., and so would not have addressed themselves to the above question.

For this precise case in hand, it would seem that only a thorough examination of the textual history of the verse can help to point in the direction in which the answer may lie. The MT appears to be firmly attested by the majority of textual witnesses, either directly by the quasi-totality of the LXX traditions and Old Latin, or indirectly by the Targum,¹¹³ Vulgate,¹¹⁴ and Syriac.¹¹⁵ Of the remaining variants, by far the most significant is that of 4QSm^a,¹¹⁶ which attests a different euphemistic device, the word of,¹¹⁷ which is also present in the Sahidic Version. Finally, a lone cursive LXX MS, c, is recorded as attesting "the LORD" in the dative, which, for those who uphold that this verse contains a secondary emendation, could be seen as very slender evidence of the original.

In view of this textual evidence, and due to the absence of stronger direct evidence, the decision taken by the HOTTP Committee seems to be the only viable one.¹¹⁸ In proposing the omission of the enemies of as a secondary addition due to "interpretative modifications" (Fac. 7) and "dependence of a variety of text forms upon one earlier form" (Fac. 3), the Committee explains its decision as follows:

110 Rashi uses kinnuy and Radaq uses the verb kinnah.

111 See above, n.13.

112 See above, n.12.

113 The Targum represents a double euphemism, since it was considered theologically incorrect for the LORD to have enemies: "The enemies of the people of the LORD".

114 The Vulgate tries to make sense of the text: "Quoniam blasphemare fecisti inimicos Domini".

115 The Syriac too tries to make it more intelligible, "You have made the enemies of the LORD great."

116 Cf. E.C. Ulrich, The Qumran text of Samuel and Josephus, Harvard 1978, p.138.

117 Concerning further use of this device, see below, pp.204ff.

118 Vol. 2, Stuttgart 1976, p.232.

The very divergence in the reading of the MT and Versions (אִיבִי) on the one hand, and 4QSm^a (דִּבֵּר) on the other, points to the lack of both of them in the original text, although there is no direct evidence. 119

The fact that there were other similar interventions on the part of later generations is an additional argument to support this case.¹²⁰ The parallel from the extra-biblical world of the existence of this type of original euphemism remains what it is, namely, evidence that this particular euphemistic device was not peculiar to the Jewish ways of interpreting the sacred text.¹²¹

In view of the real variant tradition in the Qumran text, it seems more prudent to classify this case as belonging to the category of secondary euphemisms or theological corrections which will form the subject matter of the next chapter. The uniformity between MT and LXX, and the existence of the Qumran variant tradition both show that, as an emendation, it must have taken place at an early date. 2 Sam 12:14 illustrates that there can exist a "grey area" between original and secondary euphemism; how the same idiom, at one period, could be spontaneous and congenital to the text in which it appears, by dint of frequent usage, whereas, when it appears in earlier literature, it could represent either an anachronistic insertion by later generations (as is argued for this case of 2 Sam 12:14), or the first beginnings of the use of this idiom as an original euphemism in the earlier literature (as was argued for Num 16:14 and 1 Sam 29:4).¹²²

²⁰ 1 Sam 20:16 and 25:22. These verses can be taken together since they are both concerned with "the enemies of David", and their immediate contexts are rather similar. The latter text describes David's decision to take action against Nabal's men because of Nabal's churlish refusal to co-operate with David's request for food in return for the protection he and his men had afforded Nabal's shepherds in Carmel. The resolution is expressed in an imprecation form as follows:

119 Ibid.

120 See below, pp.197-243.

121 It would be enlightening and helpful if other similar examples of this idiom were to be identified in further extra-biblical literature, whether earlier or contemporary.

122 See below, pp.191ff. concerning the euphemism "to bless" in place of "to curse".

God do so to the enemies of David and more also, if
by morning I leave so much as one male of all who
belong to him. 123

As in the case of 2 Sam 12:14, the majority of commentators¹²⁴ agree that this text contains a later insertion, and base their argumentation on two central facts. First of all, by analogy with typical imprecation formulae, one would expect the speaker to utter the threat against himself,¹²⁵ or against the person he is addressing.¹²⁶ Although C.F. Keil does not accept that the text needs to be emended,¹²⁷ he does admit that it is unusual that it is the speaker's enemies, and not the speaker, who are the object of the imprecation. Thus, in this context of David's oath, the normal expression would have been an imprecation against himself. But for motives of piety, as H.P. Smith explains:¹²⁸

A scribe could not think of David forswearing himself and
so inserted the opposite of what the original narrator said. 129

The rabbinic commentators were aware of the euphemistic nature of the MT.¹³⁰

-
- 123 On the nature of this oath form and its roots in certain primitive, almost magical, practices which attributed an unfailing efficacy to the spoken word, see J. Hempel, *op. cit.*, and the other references cited above in nn.26-27. With regard to the type of formula used here, Hempel says: "Auch tut man gut, in der Schwurformel das Unheil nicht ausdrücklich zu nennen, das im Falle des Eidbruches eintreten soll. Darum verkürzt man die Formel 'so soll Gott mir tun und noch mehr, wenn (nicht)', zu bloßem 'wenn (nicht)'." (p.34).
- 124 See above, n.103. The same decision was reached by the HOTTP Committee, Vol. 2, p.199, which cites the RSV (1952), NEB (1970), J (1973) and L (1971) translations as also adopting this reading.
- 125 Cf. 1 Sam 14:44 (Saul); 20:13 (Jonathan); 27:11 (David); 2 Sam 3:9 (Abner); 3:35 (David); 1 Kings 2:23 (Solomon); 19:2 (Jezabel); 20:10 (Ben-Hadad); 2 Kings 6:31 (Jehoram); Ruth 1:17 (Ruth).
- 126 1 Sam 3:17 (Eli, against the boy Samuel). It is noteworthy that the use of this formula as found in 25:22 is confined to the books of Samuel and Kings, with one reference from Ruth (13 in all).
- 127 *Op. cit.*, p.177.
- 128 *Op. cit.*, p.224.
- 129 This explanation rightly points to the motive for the euphemism. David did not actually keep his oath, as the subsequent narrative shows, for he was suitably mollified by Abigail. In the other cases cited above, (n.125) where he makes similar oaths (2 Sam 3:35 and 19:14) he presumably kept them. See below, n.142, in relation to 20:16.
- 130 Radaq explains that it is "A kinnuy for David". Abulwalid includes it in Chapter 27 of his grammar in the same context as Num 16:14. See above, n.78.

The second argument comes from the textual traditions. The commentators and translators who omit "the enemies of" cite the LXX as supporting the original text which should read: "God do so to David and more ..." In fact, the LXX tradition for the most part,¹³¹ does indeed attest this shorter reading. The Syriac rendering is an indirect confirmation, with "God do so to his servant David and more ..."¹³² The same type of argumentation as was used above in 2 Sam 12:14¹³³ may be applied to this variation between the MT euphemism and the Syriac variant, as a further confirmation of the secondary nature of this euphemism, the only significant difference between the two cases being that in this case the LXX itself also provides direct evidence.

Finally, apart from the textual evidence, one might add that the urgency of the imprecation formula would have been hopelessly mitigated had the euphemism been original. Moreover, if the use of this euphemism had been common practice in the time of David, one might ask why it was not used more often in the other contemporary imprecation formulae listed above?¹³⁴ Why is it only found in relation to David, and in an oath that he did not keep? Hardly because David himself knew in advance that he was not going to keep the oath! It is far more likely that a later rereading of the text realised the seriousness of such an unfulfilled oath and took steps to soften the expression.¹³⁵

This case of 1 Sam 25:22 has thus even more to recommend itself as a deliberate euphemism than the previous case of 2 Sam 12:14, and in retrospect, this stronger textual evidence for 1 Sam 25:22 constitutes a further argument in favour of 2 Sam 12:14 as a secondary euphemism. It remains now to examine the case of 1 Sam 20:16 which presents a more complicated textual situation.

1 Sam 20:16 is variously rendered by modern translations¹³⁶ and

131 Only the cursives b f h j m o s c₂e₂ attest the MT.

132 The Arabic also follows this tradition.

133 See above, nn.118 and 119.

134 See above, nn.125-126.

135 It will be seen below (n.142) that the same worry concerning an unfulfilled covenant lies at the root of this same euphemism in 1 Sam 20:16.

136 Cf. RSV, L and J which represent varying renderings based on LXX textual traditions. NEB appears to partly follow the LXX and to be partly conjectural. Buber's translation and that of the Bible du

commentators.¹³⁷ The initial difficulty with the text seems to have arisen from the absence of כרת with the verb כרת, "to make (a covenant)", so that the LXX misunderstood the text and tried to make it intelligible with various passive forms¹³⁸ within the context of Jonathan's plea. Yet this verb without its normal complement, "covenant", is used elsewhere in Samuel and Kings without any misunderstanding on the part of the LXX and modern translations.¹³⁹ If the MT is interpreted literally as follows:

Jonathan made (a covenant) with the house of David:
'May the LORD call David's enemies to account'

there is no reason to depart from the MT, which makes perfectly good sense. All that remains is the question of how to interpret "the enemies of" contained within the brief treaty imprecation of v.16b.

There is no clear textual evidence for anything other than the MT (the enemies of) within the Versions.¹⁴⁰ A smaller number of commentators than in the two previous cases just examined are prepared to see a secondary insertion here, of the same nature as in 25:22.¹⁴¹ One of the reasons for this smaller number is probably linked to the fact that many of the others have already opted for emending v.16a in such a way that it is no longer necessary to see a euphemism in v.16b. The rabbinic commentators, who follow the MT for the entire verse, are firm in seeing the euphemistic nature of the MT.¹⁴² Thus, it can be accepted that this verse does con-

Centenaire retain the MT; so too the HOTTP, Vol.2, p.190.

137 The following commentators also follow one or other of the LXX textual traditions for v.16a: S. Driver, op. cit., p.130; K. Budde, The Books of Samuel, p.68; idem, Die Bücher Samuel, p.143; W. Nowack, op. cit., p.105; P. Dhorme, op. cit., p.182f.; H.P. Smith, op. cit., p.188; A. Schulz, op. cit., pp.306-307; K. Leimbach, op. cit., p.90; W. Hertzberg, op. cit., p.132.

138 "Let (not) the name of Jonathan be found" (B, N, etc.); "be cut off" (A, and several cursives).

139 Cf. 1 Sam 11:2; 22:8; 1 Kings 8:9.

140 Some commentators would interpret the fact that ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθρῶν is found in the margin of Cod. 243 with an asterisk (cf. Field, Vol.1, p.522) and that other codices (44, 74, 106, 120, 134) read ἐχθρὸς ἐκ χειρὸς τοῦ Δαυὶδ, as indirect evidence for the secondary nature of "the enemies of". Cf. H.P. Smith, op. cit., p.189; W. Nowack, op. cit., p.105; P. Dhorme, op. cit., pp.182-83.

141 Cf. W. Nowack, P. Dhorme, H.P. Smith, A. Schulz, K. Leimbach, J.A. Maynard.

142 Rashi explains the euphemism as referring to David, because he broke the covenant later (2 Sam 18:30) in dividing the field between Mephibosheth, a genuine descendant of Jonathan, and his servant, Ziba. He

tain a euphemism of the same nature as that already examined in 25:22; the problem that remains is naturally whether it can be identified as a later insertion, i.e., a secondary euphemism, or can it be accepted as a natural part of the original text.¹⁴³

If it is a later deliberate insertion for the same motives as outlined above for 25:22,¹⁴⁴ it must have taken place sufficiently early as to have had all traces of the original reading successfully eliminated.¹⁴⁵ Although there is no direct textual evidence for the original text, it can be argued that this case is no different essentially from that of 25:22, for which there exists textual evidence for the original. The context is the same. The personality threatened by the imprecation is the same. Here too, the oath was not kept. In short, this passage is a good illustration of the complexity that exists in moving from what can be assumed to have been the "original" text to "the earliest attested text". In this case, the indirect textual evidence of 25:22, together with the contextual similarity between the two cases constitutes reasonable grounds for the removal of the secondary insertion of "the enemies of".¹⁴⁶

(iv) The Expression, "to Bless" in Place of "to Curse"

There are four passages in the book of Job¹⁴⁷ and two in Kings,¹⁴⁸

also refers to the division of the kingdom in the days of Rehoboam and Jeroboam. Radaq simply says that "the enemies of" is a kinnuy for David; should he break this covenant, the LORD would seek requital from David's hand.

- 143 Stoebe, who argued that 25:22 was an original euphemism (see above, n.105) does not translate v.16b in his commentary. He describes this half verse as unübersetzbar. Ehrlich makes no reference to it in his Randglossen.
- 144 See above, n.129.
- 145 Unless n.140 above is taken seriously. See also pp.197-204 below, where a similar situation exists for the pentateuchal passages of "seeing/appearing before the face of the LORD" as contrasted with some other similar texts outside the Pentateuch, where textual traces of the original may be detected.
- 146 Concerning other cases where it has been possible to adopt the "original" text by means of indirect evidence, see below, pp.197-204, 216ff.
- 147 Job 1:5 (Job wonders whether perhaps his sons may have "blessed" God); 1:11 and 2:5 (Satan taunts the LORD that perhaps if Job is suitably afflicted, he will "'bless' thee to thy face"); 2:9 (Job's wife encourages him to "'bless' God and die!").
- 148 1 Kings 21:10 (Jezabel's plot, containing instructions for the false witnesses against Naboth, who are to testify "you have 'blessed' God and the king") and 21:13 (the actualisation of this plot).

in which the presence of the verb "to bless" can be safely assumed to be a euphemistic usage for the opposite idea, "to curse".¹⁴⁹ While there is no difficulty in accepting that there is euphemism in these passages, there is considerable divergence among commentators and other modern writers as to whether these euphemisms are secondary insertions on the part of a later mentality,¹⁵⁰ or whether they constitute instances of original euphemism.¹⁵¹ Some commentators consider that either interpretation is possible,¹⁵² while others do not raise this question, their choice of words being such that either eventuality is covered.¹⁵³

Examination of the textual situation for these passages shows that the LXX traditions and Vulgate uphold the MT literally, with the exception of the LXX of Job 1:5 and 2:9.¹⁵⁴ The remaining Versions, particularly

-
- 149 The presence of "to bless" in front of "scorns the LORD" in Ps 10:3 constitutes a complex textual problem which is not directly parallel with the six other cases mentioned above, although some commentators include it in their treatment of these verses. If the case in Ps 10:3 contains a theological correction, the motivation for it would have more in common with such texts as 2 Sam 12:14 (see pp.184ff. above) or 2 Sam 12:9 (see pp.204ff. below).
- 150 Cf. A. Geiger, *op. cit.*, p.268; C. Ginsburg, *Introduction*, pp.366f.; K. Budde, *op. cit.*, p.3; P. Dhorme, *op. cit.*, p.4; N. Peters, *op. cit.*, p.10; P. Szczygiel, *op. cit.*, p.35; A. Weiser, *op. cit.*, p.23; G. Hölischer, *op. cit.*, p.12; J.A. Montgomery, *op. cit.*, p.331; L. Rabinowitz, *op. cit.*, (EJ), Vol.6, p.960; E. KSnig, *Stilistik*, p.40.
- 151 Cf. A. Ehrlich, *op. cit.*, Vol.6, p.182; F. Horst, *op. cit.*, p.71; G. Fohrer, *op. cit.*, p.2; J. Hempel, *op. cit.*, pp.91-3; S. Ehrenfeld, *op. cit.*, (JE), p.267. Cf. the HOTTP decision, Vol. 3, pp.2-4.
- 152 Cf. S.R. Driver - G.B. Gray, *op. cit.*, Part II, pp.4-6: "As between these alternatives the decision is not easy"; B. Duhm, *op. cit.*, p.5; T. Nöldeke, *op. cit.*, p.89; R. Gordis, *The Book of Job*, p.13.
- 153 Cf. M. Pope, *op. cit.*, p.8: "A standard scribal euphemism" or J. Lévesque, *op. cit.*, p.189: "un euphémisme théologique". In their studies concerning "curse formulae" in the Old Testament, both S.H. Blank *op. cit.*, p.83f. and H.C. Brichto, *op. cit.*, p.170f. take the euphemistic usage for granted without reference to its antiquity.
- 154 In Job 1:5, the LXX, "entertain evil thoughts" can only be an interpretation of the euphemism, "to bless" and not a free rendering or paraphrase for an original "curse". Moreover, Aquila reads "bless" for 1:5. In 2:9 the LXX contains an extended "midrash" on the part of Job's wife, in which she explains why she cannot tolerate the situation any longer, and so urges Job to "say some word against the LORD and die!" Here too, the extended LXX reading can only represent an interpretation of the euphemism and not a real textual variant for an original "curse". For the actual contents of this "midrash", see below, n.158.

the Targum and Syriac, interpret¹⁵⁵ the euphemism of the MT, for the most part.¹⁵⁶ Thus, the overall pattern which emerges from the textual evidence is that the euphemism is sufficiently well anchored in the textual traditions as to be of very ancient provenance, if not indeed, original. Is it possible to determine with any greater certitude that the euphemism in these cases is original? Two observations may help.

Firstly, examination of the contexts of these six cases shows that it is either a question of false witness (1 Kings 21:10,13), or taunts concerning the innocent Job (1:11; 2:5,9), or Job himself who hopes that his children have not been guilty of blasphemy (1:5). There is no actual blasphemy involved.¹⁵⁷ There is a certain irony in Job 1:11; 2:5 and 9 in the use of "bless". Job is the paragon of virtue (1:1,8,22; 2:3), the man who, par excellence, blesses God (1:21). The taunts of Satan to the LORD, expressed in euphemistic and ironic terms would lose their present impact and colour, if reduced to a more prosaic, albeit blasphemous, literal rendering of the euphemism. The same is true of Job 2:9. His wife, who is overwhelmed by the sudden accumulation of misfortune, and irked by Job's apparently passive acceptance of it, addresses him in the imperative, "Bless God and die!" (the underlying irony and possible emotional tension is also present in the rhetorical question which precedes the euphemism, "Do you still hold fast to your integrity?"). Again, the literary skill, which is present in the use of the euphemism here, could never have been rendered by a bald, blasphemous imperative. The LXX "midrashic" expansion shows how well it understood these few words on the lips of Job's wife.¹⁵⁸ If one ac-

155 See above, n.79, for another similar interpretation of a "euphemism" by the Vulgate and Syriac.

156 Only in Job 2:9 does the Targum render the MT, "bless"; an indirect confirmation that a substitution of "curse" would be even less feasible here than in the other three cases in Job, where the Targum is happy to interpret the euphemism with the verb *לר*, "to provoke". For all six instances, the Syriac uses a verb "to curse".

157 Cf. S. Blank, *op. cit.*, p.83: "The fear of the effective power of the spoken word best explains the total absence of blasphemy in the Bible. Although there are numerous examples of the formula for blessing, with God as the object of the blessing, the Bible nowhere contains the curse formula directed against God, i.e., blasphemy. This is all the more remarkable because the Bible is by no means lacking in passages referring to the possibility of a curse directed against God. The classic instance is Job 2:9."

158 "After a long time passed, his wife said to him: How long will you endure and say, 'See, I will wait a bit longer, looking for the hope of my salvation'. Look, your memory is already blotted out

cepts that the euphemism in these three passages is original, it would be inconsistent to deny it to the fourth instance in Job (1:5), separated only by five verses from the nearest one (1:11). By the same token, if one accepts its authenticity in Job, it would be logical to do so also in 1 Kings in view of the context and the textual evidence.

The second observation concerns the fact that the Old Testament contains many powerful and imaginative figures of speech, not least of these being euphemism. Reference to a whole host of euphemistic phrases, which do not require any correction in the view of commentators (simply because the context is not directly theological!) should serve to strengthen the possibility of euphemism a fortiori in a context which would be "shocking" without the euphemism.

There is already a good biblical foundation for many euphemistic idioms, particularly in relation to death, dying and the dead. Enoch's disappearance is euphemistically described as "And he was not, for God took him" (Gen 5:24). Jacob refers to his own death as "resting" with his fathers (Gen 47:30), and Joshua, in his valedictory speech, says "And now I am about to go the way of all the earth".¹⁵⁹ Nathan discretely refers to David's death by saying, "When your days are fulfilled and you lie down with your fathers" (2 Sam 7:12), and Job describes his own imminent fate as "I shall go the way whence I shall not return" (16:22).¹⁶⁰ Euphemisms for various aspects of sexuality¹⁶¹ and bodily organs¹⁶² and functions,¹⁶³ which

from the earth, the sons and daughters, the travail and pangs of my womb, whom I reared and toiled for nothing. Any you, you sit in wormy decay, passing nights in the open, while I roam and drudge from place to place, and from house to house, waiting for the sun to go down, so that I may rest from my toils and the griefs which now grip me. Now say some word against the LORD and die!"

This midrash has striking points of similarity with the Testament of Job, 24:2-5; cf. ed. R.A. Kraft, The Testament of Job according to the SV Text, Montana 1974, p.47.

- 159 Josh 23:14. The same expression occurs also in 1 Kings 2:2.
- 160 Jeremiah describes the dead as those who "sleep a perpetual sleep and do not wake" in 51:39 and 57, while Daniel refers to them as those "who sleep in the dust of the earth" (12:2).
- 161 Cf. the use of the following verbs: to know (Gen 4:1,17,25; 19:5; 24:16; 38:26; Judg 19:25; 1 Sam 1:19; 1 Kings 1:4), to draw near (Gen 20:4; Lev 18:14; Is 8:3), to come to (Gen 6:4; 16:2; 19:31; 29:23; 30:3; 38:2,8,etc.).
- 162 Cf. Is 57:8; Hos 2:11; Ez 16:8; Gen 9:22; Ex 20:26; Is 48:1.
- 163 Cf. Gen 18:11; 31:35; Judg 3:24; 1 Sam 24:3. Cf. Megilla 25b.

abound in the Talmud, have some solid biblical foundations. In view of these considerations and observations, it seems possible to include these six cases of "to bless" in place of "to curse" as further examples of original euphemism, where yet once again the equation, "euphemism = emendation", may not be maintained.

4. Conclusions

The foregoing pages of this chapter have been devoted to a study of the various uses of original euphemism and other oblique or substitute expressions. The frequency and the variety of usage in rabbinic and biblical literature serve as an illuminating background for the emergence of the tiqqune sopherim tradition. One of the immediate results of this investigation has been the opportunity of distinguishing more closely between the terms euphemism and emendation which some commentators use interchangeably.

1° "Does Euphemism equal Emendation?" By attempting to clarify the use of euphemism and other related phenomena, it has been possible to reply to the above question in a more nuanced way:

- (i) Euphemism equals emendation in the context of the tiqqune sopherim tradition, in that both tiqqun and kinnuy are used interchangeably to refer to the same tradition. 164
- (ii) Euphemism equals emendation if one can identify the euphemism as secondary. 165
- (iii) Euphemism does not equal emendation in those cases in the biblical text where it can be shown that the euphemism is original. 166
- (iv) Finally, it must be admitted that there is a grey area, a "no man's land", between those texts which can be safely identified as original euphemism and those which are secondary euphemisms, particularly where there is no direct evidence 167 for the original text. The situation becomes more complex when it is the same idiom, which in one body of literature is original, but which constitutes a secondary insertion in another.

164 See above, pp.168-169, bearing in mind that this equation is only valid to the degree that the tiqqune sopherim in fact contain some genuine emendations (see above, p.129).

165 See above, p.183f. concerning 2 Sam 12:14; 1 Sam 25:22 and 20:16; see below, Ch. 6.

166 See above, p.179, concerning Num 16:14 and 1 Sam 29:4; p.101f. concerning Jer 2:11 and Ps 106:20, and p.191f. concerning Job 1:5,11; 2:5, 9 and 1 Kings 21:10 and 13.

167 See above, p.187f. concerning 1 Sam 20:16.

2^o Another point of contact between the use of euphemism and other related phenomena and the origins of the tiqqune sopherim is that one might conceivably be able to reconstruct the "creation" of certain of the tiqqune sopherim as follows:

Stage One: Given the frequency with which "euphemism" is used for theological motives in both Talmud and Midrashim, in commenting on the biblical verse, an existing textual form is interpreted as euphemistic.¹⁶⁸

Stage Two: The suffix is imagined as having once been actually written in the first person singular, referring to God, but for theological motives, was duly emended. All that was required for these two stages was a word with a third person suffix, etc., and a reasonably apt or pliable context.¹⁶⁹

Stage Three: The integration of such texts into a tradition, which was not yet clearly formulated, but which contained awareness that certain texts had actually been changed for theological motives.

Stage Four: The full-blown systematised tradition of "Eighteen Tiqqune Sopherim" (even if the "eighteen" cases varied from list to list).

168 In some cases there would have been a basis for a euphemistic interpretation (as in Jer 2:11 and Ps 106:20), see above, p.182f., whereas in others a more fertile imagination would have been required (Mal 1:12,13; Ez 8:17; 2 Sam 16:12).

169 See above, nn.18 and 48.

CHAPTER 6

AN EXAMINATION OF CERTAIN BIBLICAL VERSES WHICH ILLUSTRATE WITH
REASONABLE CERTITUDE THAT THEOLOGICAL CORRECTIONS DID REALLY TAKE PLACE

The analysis of the eighteen officially listed tiqqune sopherim undertaken above,¹ has led to the conclusion, that, while the basic intuition behind these lists may be trusted, the greater part of the existing lists must be regarded as due to midrashic exploitation and development, without genuine textual foundation. The lists, though now very much contaminated, nevertheless bear witness to a certain corrective initiative undertaken, for the most part, from motives of piety and respect for God. Because the preservation and transmission of the sacred text was such a serious matter, it is understandable that this initiative was never given undue publicity.

Consequently, it is not surprising to find other traces of this phenomenon outside of the official lists. In other words, the possibility of "unofficial" tiqqune sopherim, or theological corrections² must be taken seriously. Their existence, in fact, provides a most convincing corroboration for the position adopted above with regard to the genuine tiqqune sopherim.³ Viewed in this perspective, the tiqqunim traditions lose their exhaustive character; in so far as witnessing to a historical corrective activity, they now serve as sign-posts to a more wide-spread phenomenon not preserved in any list. Since an attempt to track down all such "unofficial" emendations would entail a study of considerable proportions, a venture which is beyond the limits of the present chapter, the following paragraphs will be devoted to four main groupings or types of theological corrections, with a number of textual illustrations for each category.

1. "Seeing the Face of God" or "Appearing before God?"

There are certain passages in the Bible, which, in their present

1 See above, pp.61-129.

2 See above, p.170, concerning this term. It is used interchangeably with the other term, "secondary euphemism".

3 See above, pp.61-70 for Zech 2:12 and pp.76-80 for Job 7:20; 1 Sam 3:13.

niph'al form of punctuation, are concerned with "appearing before the LORD".⁴ There seems to be no doubt but that this niph'al punctuation represents a deliberate emendation or theological correction,⁵ the aim of which was to render the anthropomorphic expression of "seeing the face of God" in a theologically more acceptable formula, in keeping with a more perceptive outlook which was mindful of Ex 33:20. S.D. Luzzatto puts it well in his commentary on Is 1:12 as follows:

"When you come to appear before the LORD". The intention of the prophet is to say, "To see the face of". This is a metaphorical figure of speech, as when a man comes to visit his superior, comparable to "For truly, to see your face is like seeing the face of God" (Gen 33:10). However, the punctuators (according to the tradition in their possession from the sages of the Second Temple) corrected the expression out of respect, on account of the ordinary simple folk, for they do not understand metaphorical usage ... 6

He rightly points out that the present construction with the niph'al and the particle MM is awkward. This fact is best seen in those cases where the infinitive construct is punctuated in a niph'al form but lacks the usual he (Ex 34:24; Deut 31:11 and Is 1:12). If one compares these three forms with other normal niph'al infinitive constructs⁷ one notices that:

- (a) the he is present in all these other forms;
- (b) it is absent only in those forms which are specifically concerned with coming to the sanctuary "to appear before the LORD".

The simplest explanation for this is that these three forms were originally gal forms which required no he for the infinitive construct. Examination

4 Eleven passages may be grouped as follows:

- (a) Ex 23:15; 34:20 and Deut 16:16b (לֹא יֵרָאָה, לֹא יֵרָאָה): "They shall not appear before me empty handed".
- (b) Ex 23:17; 34:23; Deut 16:16a (יֵרָאָה): "All your males shall appear before the LORD..."
- (c) Ex 34:24; Deut 31:11; Is 1:12 (לֵרְאוֹת): "When you/all Israel go up to appear before the LORD".
- (d) 1 Sam 1:22 (וַיֵּרָאָה): "That he may appear before the LORD".
- (e) Ps 42:3 (וַיֵּרָאָה): "When shall I come and appear before God?"

Ps 84:8 will be examined separately below, pp.202-204.

5 Cf. in particular, S.D. Luzzatto, Il Profeta Isaia, Volgarizzato e Commentato, Padua 1855, pp.30-31, whose treatment of these passages (Is 1:12; Ps 42:3; Ex 23:15,17; 43:24; Deut 31:11 and 1 Sam 1:22) is expanded by A. Geiger, op. cit., pp.337-39, who in turn is cited by Ginsburg, Introduction, pp.457-59.

6 Op. cit., p.30.

7 Cf. Judg 13:21; 1 Sam 3:21; 2 Sam 17:17; 1 Kings 18:2; Ez 21:29.

of the contexts of the other pentateuchal passages shows that they too are concerned with the statutory pilgrimage to the Temple, and that the awkwardness of the expression is removed once the gal punctuation is restored. The remaining cases of 1 Sam 1:22 and Ps 42:3, together with Is 1:12 will be examined later.

That this type of theological correction took place at an early stage, and that the Masoretes are merely preserving a very ancient traditional emendation becomes evident on examination of the textual situation for these passages. The pentateuchal passages have scarcely any hint of an original gal. The LXX and Vulgate textual traditions faithfully record the MT niph'al punctuation in their renderings. The same is true for the Targums of Onqelos, Pseudo-Jonathan and Neofiti, with one slight exception in the last mentioned.⁸ The Fragmentum Targum for Ex 34:20 also attests an active verbal form, למחמי, "to see". One may rightly ask whether these two isolated targumic readings constitute sufficient textual evidence as to warrant the adoption of the "original" reading throughout the eight pentateuchal passages?

This question becomes more acute in the case of 1 Sam 1:22. Hannah does not go up to Shiloh to join in the yearly sacrifice to the LORD, explaining to her husband, that "as soon as the child is weaned, I will bring him, that he may appear in the presence of the LORD" (MT). There is no textual evidence for anything other than the MT niph'al punctuation. Yet, the similarity of the consonantal phrase, ונראה את פני, together with the awkwardness already mentioned when this is pointed as niph'al,⁹ as well as a typical context of pilgrimage to the sanctuary, makes it almost certainly a case where the original phrase must have been "Then we shall see the face

8 Neofiti at Deut 31:11 attests an active form, למחמייה, "to see", in contradistinction to the other pentateuchal passages where it has the passive/reflexive form, למחמייה, "to appear". It is a pity that the Spanish, French and English translations in Diez Macho's edition of Neofiti (Neophyti I, Vol.V, Deuteronomio, Madrid 1978) do not recognise the existence of this variant at Deut 31:11, but assimilate their translations to the other seven passages, "to appear before" (even if the variant be only the result of an inadvertent omission of a single consonant, tau).

9 Cf. S.D. Luzzatto, *op. cit.*, p.30. In this particular case, the awkwardness is hidden in the similarity of the consonantal forms of the first person plural gal and third person singular niph'al (נראה).

of the LORD".¹⁰ The ease with which the change could be made from the first person plural qal (cohortative) to the third person singular, niph'al (perfect), together with the sequence of events involved,¹¹ probably accounts for the total success of this particular emendation.¹² Here is a textual situation parallel to that observed above in the case of 1 Sam 20:16.¹³ It is probably most prudent and, at the same time, consistent, to adopt the same approach here as there.¹⁴

The textual evidence for an original qal in Is 1:12 and Ps 42:3 is a little more encouraging, although not spectacular. In the case of Is 1:12, de Rossi notes one MS¹⁵ as attesting a qal punctuation, which is also the reading of the Syriac. Ps 42:3 has both Targum and Syriac attesting an original qal, as well as a small number of de Rossi's MSS.¹⁶ One might add that the New Testament statement in Rev 22:4: "They shall see his face", which occurs in a context of messianic fulfilment, appears as a direct answer to the psalmist's question: "When shall I enter and see your face?" In both cases then, there is a minimal amount of textual evidence for the original qal punctuation, which, when taken in conjunction with the observations made above concerning the awkwardness of construction and the obvious theological motivation behind the change of punctuation, makes it possible to adopt the qal for these two readings.¹⁷

10 The following commentators consider the qal form as original in this verse: K. Budde, *The Books of Samuel*, p.53; *idem*, *Die Bücher Samuel*, p.11; H.P. Smith, *op. cit.*, pp.12-13; in addition to Luzzatto and Geiger. Ginsburg does not refer to this verse at all in his treatment of these passages.

11 "That he may appear ... and he will abide".

12 It is not necessary to postulate an original וראה, "and he shall see", as does Maynard in *La Bible du Centenaire*, Tome II, p.87. Budde's remark in *The Books of Samuel*, p.53 is more realistic: "Since everywhere else ... the alteration undertaken from a sense of reverence extends only to the vowels, it is better to restrict ourselves to these and to explain the form as an imperfect". H.P. Smith and K. Budde in their commentaries explain the "original" qal form as cohortative with a simple waw: "And let us see ..."

13 See above, pp.190-191.

14 Namely, to accept the "original" qal on the basis of indirect textual evidence (see further concerning Is 1:12 and Ps 42:3) and contextual similarity.

15 "MS 575, hispanus prima manu (init. sec. XIV)".

16 MSS 337, 368, 670, 864, 879, primo 43, 380, 683.

17 The following commentators accept the qal as original in Ps 42:3:

The question still remains unanswered as regards the pentateuchal passages. Is there sufficient evidence there to adopt the qal form for all eight passages, since they are close to each other and occur in three groups of parallel forms,¹⁸ even though there is only slight evidence for two of the eight passages?¹⁹ Before finally attempting to answer this question for the pentateuchal passages, it should be noted that some other slight traces of a qal reading may be detected in the Mekhilta of R. Simeon b. Yoḥai, who, in interpreting Ex 23:17, "All your males shall appear/see", says that the prescription excludes "the blind person who cannot see".²⁰ In its simplest form in the Mekhilta this interpretation presupposes a qal form, even if later talmudic development contains a double play on words, which seems to presuppose a niph'al as well as a qal punctuation. For the talmudic passages explain that the one who is blind in one eye is excluded on the grounds that just as the One before whom one appears has the plenitude of sight, so too, the one who comes to be seen should have sight in both eyes.²¹

Given the quasi-certitude that these eight passages represent very ancient emendations, which have left only slight traces of the original reading in secondary and indirect sources, it seems possible nonetheless to be able to adopt the qal original form for all passages, for the same reasons as outlined above concerning 1 Sam 20:16.²²

As a result of this examination of the expression, "Appearing before/seeing the face of the LORD", and its various parallels, the following observations can be made:

- (a) All eleven passages with MT niph'al punctuation represent theological corrections for an original qal, "to see the face of".
- (b) These corrections belong to a very early period predating the LXX and other textual traditions.

F. Baethgen, *op. cit.*, p.119; C. Briggs, *op. cit.*, p.368 (yet he translates as niph'al); B. Duhm, *op. cit.*, p.123; H. Gunkel, *op. cit.*, p.181; R. Kittel, *op. cit.*, pp.149-150; H.-J. Kraus, *op. cit.*, pp.470-472; see also H. Wildberger, *Jesaja*, (BK), Neukirchen 1972, pp.32-33, and the *Remarks* in Vol. 4 of the *HOTTP*, New York 1979 at Is 1:12, p.2f.

18 See above, n.4.

19 Ex 34:20 and Deut 31:11.

20 See also the Mekhilta of R. Ishmael at Ex 23:14 where he interprets v.17 in a similar manner.

21 Cf. Sanhedrin 4b; 'Arakin 2b; Ḥagiga 2a-b. This talmudic interpretation is also adopted by Rashi.

22 See above, p.191 concerning 1 Sam 20:16.

- (c) In the case of the pentateuchal passages, only faint traces of an original qal can be detected in the Palestinian targumic tradition, and indirectly in the Mekhiltas of R. Simeon b. Yoḥai and R. Ishmael.
- (d) The original qal of Is 1:12 and Ps 42:3 may be adopted on the basis of direct textual evidence, whereas the original qal of the pentateuchal passages may be adopted on the basis of indirect textual evidence of Is 1:12 and Ps 42:3, and some very slight direct textual evidence from two targumic readings.
- (e) The case of 1 Sam 1:22 remains more ambiguous in that it can only claim indirect evidence for an original qal.

By way of a post-scriptum to these eleven passages, some few words are now included concerning Ps 84:8. This verse, although not an exact parallel, bears a certain resemblance to the foregoing passages, inasmuch as an "appearance" in the Temple is involved. The MT may be translated as follows:

They go from strength to strength, ²³
One will appear before God in Zion.

The textual problems centre on the words, יֵרָאֵה אֱלֹהִים. As the text now stands, there is a threefold difficulty, reflected in various attempts by commentators and translators to correct the text. There is, first of all, the difference between the plural form of v.8a, "they go" (i.e., the pilgrims en route to Zion, the men of v.5) and the singular MT niph'al form in v.8b.²⁴ Secondly, the same types of observations may be made about "appearing before God" in this verse as were made in the preceding paragraphs,²⁵ although the expression is not as awkward here due to the presence of אֵל rather than אֱלֹהִים.²⁶ But it is precisely this proposition "unto" which must

23 Cf. M. Buber's translation of v.8b which renders the MT very accurately: "Man wird sich sehen lassen vor Gott".

24 A number of commentators and translators either deliberately change the verb to a plural niph'al form, or render it in a plural sense (indefinite); cf. F. Delitzsch, op. cit., p.554f.; A. Ehrlich, op. cit., p.202; and the translations of Osty, Pleiade and TOB. This change is already present in Jerome's translation.

25 Other commentators and authors change the verb from niph'al to qal after the analogy of the passages in Ex 23:15 and parallels. They also change it to a plural form. Cf. B. Duhm, op. cit., p.214; R. Kittel, op. cit., p.279; H. Gunkel, op. cit., p.368; H.-J. Kraus, op. cit., p.746 and the translations of La Bible du Centenaire, L and the critical apparatus of BHS (Bardtke), although there is no textual support for an active verbal form.

26 In passing, it may be noted that in one of the eleven passages examined just above (Ex 23:17), the preposition אֵל is also present, but,

also be examined more closely, for there is strong textual evidence that the present vocalisation is camouflaging an original אל , "God".²⁷

Beginning with this third point, namely, the MT punctuation of אל if it can be demonstrated with reasonable certitude that this is an emended form of an original "God of gods", then the MT punctuation of the other elements of v.8b will also be called into question. The textual forms of the LXX, Aquila, Vulgate and Syriac presuppose an original "God of gods", while Symmachus and Jerome (Juxta Hebraeos) follow the MT. The targumic paraphrase likewise indirectly attests the MT.²⁸ The phrase, אל אלהים , does not have an exact identical biblical parallel, but two passages are very close to it, Josh 22:22²⁹ and Ps 50:1.³⁰ In Deut 11:36, the phrase אל אלים is almost identical with the phrase in Ps 84:8, and is translated by the LXX exactly as for Ps 84:8: $\acute{o} \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma \tau\omega\nu \theta\epsilon\omega\nu$, "the God of gods." One may ask then why this emendation was operated here. Part of the reason may have been to avoid any suggestion of polytheism,³¹ and part of the reason may be linked to the motivation associated with the niph'al interpretation of the eleven passages examined above, "To appear before the LORD", although the original text in this case is different from the original in these other cases. In the other passages the emendation aimed at avoiding

as Luzzatto points out (p.30), a number of MSS (Kennicott) have the particle אל , as in the other similar passages.

- 27 Cf. the following commentators who render this preposition as "God": B. Duhm, *op. cit.*, p.214; F. Baethgen, *op. cit.*, p.259; C. Briggs, *op. cit.*, p.225; E. Kbnig, *op. cit.*, p.303; R. Kittel, *op. cit.*, p.279; H.-J. Kraus, *op. cit.*, p.746 and the translations of RSV, NEB and J (3rd ed.). However, some omit the second אלהים , "God" (Kittel, Kraus); some substitute Yahweh in its place (Briggs, Baethgen) and J reads it as "unto them" (a conjecture without foundation).
- 28 "The work of the law (undertaken) by them will be seen before God, whose majesty dwells in Zion".
- 29 One could translate this verse as "Yahweh, the God of gods", or follow the MT phrasing, "the Mighty One, God, the LORD".
- 30 Again, the MT phrasing separates the two words so that the first is not punctuated as construct, but the LXX translates as "the God of gods."
- 31 The MT phrasing of Jos 22:22 and Ps 50:1, "the Mighty One, God ..." and Aquila's rendering of Ps 84:8 ($\lambda\omicron\chi\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$) are less daring "euphemistic" attempts. Masseketh Sopherim, IV,16 (cf. ed. M. Higger, *Maseket Soferim*, New York 1937, p.145) cited by Norzi in his *Minḥat Shai* notes *in loco* and A. Geiger, *op. cit.*, p.339, protects this tradition represented by the MT, by pointing out that the first (אל) is profane and the second (אלהים) is sacred. See below, also, pp.211ff., concerning Deut 32:8 and the emendation there, which is also avoiding potential polytheism.

the phrase that "Man should see the face of God". In this case, the original text was already in a niph'al form, but with God as subject: "The God of gods shall appear in Zion". That this rendering of v.8b is original and best fits the context can be illustrated in three ways. Firstly, it has the support of the LXX, Aquila, Vulgate, Syriac and Targum, even if the subject of the niph'al in the targumic paraphrase is no longer God. Secondly, there are other biblical parallels for a niph'al form with God as subject, designating a theophany.³² Finally, by retaining God as the subject of this niph'al, there is no need to change the verb, either to a plural form³³ or to an active form³⁴ as do several of the commentators. The outcome of the ascent to Jerusalem for the pilgrims was a theophany in Zion.³⁵

The MT of Ps 84:8 is, therefore, a good example of a theological emendation with a complex aim. On the one hand, it eliminates a potential polytheistic expression, and on the other, it suppresses a theophany by annexing the verse to another type of secondary euphemism, namely, that of "appearing before God" instead of "seeing him". The presence of a strong textual tradition for the original among the Versions makes it easier to establish the existence of this emendation than in the case of the eleven above mentioned passages of Ex 23:15 and parallels, and in retrospect, strengthens the interpretation adopted above, that these eleven cases are instances of secondary euphemism.

2. Further Textual Changes so that God is no longer the Direct Agent or Object in a Phrase

(a) 2 Sam 12:9. In the LORD's severe rebuking of David, by means of the prophet Nathan, for the Bathsheba affair and its consequences, the following question is asked in 2 Sam 12:9:

Why have you despised the word of the LORD,
to do what is evil in his sight?

That the MT contains a theological emendation effected through the deliber-

32 Cf. niph'al perfect: Ex 3:16; 4:1,5; Lev 9:4; 1 Kings 3:5; 9:2; Jer 31:3; Ps 102:17; niph'al imperfect: Gen 22:14; Zech 9:14; niph'al waw consecutive: Gen 12:7; 17:1; 18:1; 26:2,24; 39:9; Deut 31:15; 1 Kings 9:2; 2 Chron 7:12.

33 See above, n.24.

34 See above, n.25.

35 The following authors, translators, etc., accept that this (LXX) reading is original: Geiger, Baethgen, König; RSV, NEB, HOTTP (Vol.3,p.343).

ate insertion of "the word of" appears virtually certain.

Three types of arguments may be adduced in favour of this position. First of all, there is some textual support for "Why have you despised the LORD" in the critical apparatus of Brooke-McLean and in Field, stating that Theodotion and the minuscules b o c₂e₂ do not have "the word of". Further examination of this evidence reveals that, in fact, for this section of Samuel,³⁶ the Palestinian recension was placed in the column normally containing the Old Greek, which was re-located in the sixth column, which normally contains Theodotion's recension. The testimony of b o c₂e₂ and "Theodotion" for the Old Greek of this section of Samuel-Kings (2 Sam 11:2 - 1 Kings 2:11)³⁷ means that for this particular instance, the variant textual evidence is particularly interesting and telling. It is rounded off by a similar reading in Chrysostom,³⁸ Theodoret³⁹ and also the Old Latin.⁴⁰ The remainder of the textual tradition attests the fuller MT. It is easier to explain the presence of "the word of" in the MT as an insertion for theological motives than to account for its absence in the Old Greek.

The immediate context of vv.9-10 also supports this position. In v.10, it is said: "The sword shall never depart from your house, because you have despised me". This time, the same verb of "despising" has a suffix, which prevented any interference; but it also shows indirectly that the verb of despising in the preceding verse must have been originally followed by the direct object, the LORD.⁴¹

Finally, if one compares the euphemistic device used here with that used in the Qumran textual tradition for v.14 of this same chapter,⁴² one finds a similar pattern, "the word of", a pattern so well established in the Targums that, for that body of literature, it constitutes an ori-

36 Cf. D. Barthélemy, Les Devanciers d'Aquila, pp.128-43.

37 Ibid., pp.128-29 and p.139 in particular.

38 Cf. ed. B. de Montfaucon, Johannis Chrysostomi Opera Omnia quae Exstant, Paris 1836-39, Vol.5, p.2, Commentary on Psalm 3.

39 Cf. ed. J.L. Schulze, Theodoretus, Episcopus Cyri. Omnia Opera ex recensione Iacobi Sirmondi, 5 Volumes, Halle 1769-74, Vol.1, p.426.

40 Cf. P. Sabatier, op. cit., in loco.

41 The following commentators and writers accept that the original text here did not contain "the word of": K. Budde, op. cit., p.256; P. Dhorme, op. cit., p.359; H.P. Smith, op. cit., p.323; the translations of Osty, J, and the HOTTP, Vol.2, p.232.

ginal euphemism. Here, however, there can be no doubt that it is a secondary euphemism, possibly influenced by the background of "targumism".⁴³

(b) 1 Sam 2:17. This verse sums up the preceding description (vv.12-16) of how the sons of Eli were worthless men (lit., "sons of Be-lial"):

Thus, the sin of the young men (הַנְּעָרִים) was very great in the sight of the LORD; for the men treated the offering of the LORD with contempt.

(כִּי נָאֲצוּ הַנְּעָרִים אֶת מִנְחַת יְהוָה)

At first sight, one wonders who these "men" in v.17b are. Are they "the young men" of v.17a (the sons of Eli) or are they other people? The flow of the narrative from v.12 onwards has for aim to indicate how Eli's sons "had no regard for the LORD" (v.12b). It would be strange to interpret these "men" as other than the sons of Eli, yet the repetition of a subject in the same verse, using a different word, "men", rather than "youths", causes some difficulty.⁴⁴ This difficulty is removed if the insertion of "the men" is recognised as a theological correction, having for aim the separation of the verb "to scorn" from its immediate object, "the offering of the LORD".⁴⁵

In support of this view, the following textual evidence may be cited: the LXX does not repeat the subject of the verb "to scorn", but clearly interprets that it is the παιδαρίους of v.17a;⁴⁶ 4QSm^a also attests this reading.⁴⁷ Of lesser importance in comparison to the above variants

42 See above, p.187f.

43 Cf. D. Muñoz León, "Apéndice sobre El Memra de Yahweh en el MS Neophyti I" in *Neophyti I, Vol. III Levítico*, Madrid 1971, pp.70*-83*; R. Haywood, "The Memra of YHWH and the development of its Use in Targum Neofiti I", *JJS* 24 (1973) 412-418; L. Sabourin, "The Memra of God in the Targums", *BThB* 6 (1976) 79-85.

44 Cf. the different attempts of S.R. Driver, *op. cit.*, p.24; A. Ehrlich, *op. cit.*, p.171, to interpret who these "men" were.

45 See above, p.183f. for a similar type of correction, associated with the same verb, "to scorn" in 2 Sam 12:14, where the enemies of has the same function of separating the verb of scorning from its object, immediately following.

46 καὶ ἦν ἡ ἀμαρτία ... τῶν παιδαρίων μεγάλη σφοδρά, ὅτι ἡθέτουσαν τὴν θυσίαν Κυρίου.

47 Cf. E.C. Ulrich, *op. cit.*, p.62: נָאֲצוּ אֵם.

is one MS of Kennicott which also lacks "men" in v.17b.⁴⁸ This strong textual evidence of the LXX and Qumran, together with a typical context of disrespect for the LORD, suffices for the omission of this secondary deliberate insertion.⁴⁹

One final observation worth recording for this case is concerned with the word chosen here for insertion, האנשים, "the men". It is possible that the choice here may have been influenced by Num 16:30: כי נאצו האנשים האלה את יהוה. In turn, it may be remarked that the repetition of "these men" (cf. v.29) in this phrase may have overtones of an original euphemism used quite spontaneously.⁵⁰ There is no textual problem here, and the repetition of "these men" fits smoothly in its context. It may, therefore, have served as a model for the rather awkward insertion of "the men" in this present case of 1 Sam 2:17.

(c) Isaiah 48:11. The MT of Is 48:11 translates as follows:

For my own sake, for my own sake, I do it,
How should it be profaned?
I will not give my glory to another.

The words "How should it be profaned" raise an obvious question, namely, to what does the subject of the verb refer? Commentators and translators adopt various solutions. Up to the discovery of the Qumran scrolls, and indeed in some cases, still after, the majority of commentators, etc., were content either to emend the text by inserting the Septuagint reading⁵¹, "How should my name be profaned?"⁵², or to understand "my name" as being implicitly

48 MS 220 (end of 12th. c., in rabbinic characters).

49 Commentators, etc., who accept this viewpoint include: J. Wellhausen, op. cit., p.45f.; K. Budde, op. cit., p.19; W. Nowack, op. cit., p.19; P. Dhorme, op. cit., p.37; H.P. Smith, op. cit., p.19; A. Schulz, op. cit., p.37; J.A. Maynard, op. cit., p.89; J. Stoebe, op. cit., (probably) p.109; the Jerusalem Bible (3rd ed.) translates according to the LXX without indicating any textual basis.

50 See above, pp.179-182, concerning this type of original euphemism in the Bible.

51 τὸ ἑμὸν ὄνομα; cf. P. Sabatier, op. cit., in loco for the Vetus Latina: "quia nomen meum polluitur".

52 Cf. RSV; TOB; J; Pléiade; Osty; F. Feldmann, Das Buch Isaias, (EH), Vol. 2, Münster 1926, p.119; C.R. North, The Second Isaiah. Introduction, Translation and Commentary to Chapters XL - LV, London 1964, p.53; J.L. McKenzie, Second Isaiah, (AB), New York 1968, p.94.

present,⁵³ particularly in view of the preceding v.9.⁵⁴ The reading of 1QIs^{a55}, "How should I be profaned?", which is further strengthened by the Vulgate⁵⁶ and Syriac,⁵⁷ however, seems to suggest that the MT difficulty comes not from the omission of שמי, "my name", but from a change of an original first person to third person.

In other words, the textual evidence for this verse can be interpreted as follows: the original text contained a first person singular לחל/חל, with the question "How should I be profaned?"⁵⁸ Such a statement was deemed in need of emendation, so it would have been a simple matter to omit the 'aleph,⁵⁹ if the original text was written plene, or to substitute a yodh for the 'aleph if written defectively. The LXX reading in turn can be interpreted either as a secondary euphemism in its own right or as a subsequent attempt to interpret the emended Hebrew text, through the insertion of "my name", no doubt facilitated by the context of vv. 9-11 and such parallels as Ez 20:9, 14, 22. It is easier to explain the MT and LXX readings as derived either concurrently or successively from the simpler and less theologically apt Qumran textual form,⁶⁰ than to imagine some

-
- 53 Cf. Rashi and Radaq; A. Knobel, Der Prophet Jesaja, (KeH), Leipzig 1854 (2nd ed.), p.357; K. Marti, Das Buch Jesaja, (KHC), Tübingen 1900, p.323; B. Duhm, Das Buch Jesaja, (HK), Göttingen 1902 (2nd ed.), p.327; J. Fischer, Das Buch Isaias, (HSAT), Bonn 1939, p.97; L.G. Rignell, A Study on the Book of Isaiah, Ch. 40-55, Lund 1956, p.53.
- 54 The conjectural emendation of NEB, which transposes a word, "my praise", from v.9, cannot be accepted, as it is without textual foundation. The same observation is true also for A. Ehrlich's conjectural emendation to אחלל, op. cit., Vol. 4, p.176.
- 55 לחל איחל. Cf. E.Y. Kutscher, The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll. 1QIs^a, Leiden 1974, p.242. Kutscher's attempt to link this form to the root חל, "to wait" is unnecessary and inaccurate.
- 56 "Ut non blasphemem".
- 57 The Syriac reads a first person singular form. See M.H. Gottstein, "Die Jesaja-Rolle im Lichte von Peschitta und Targum", Biblica 35 (1954) 51-71. He suggests that the original word underlying both Qumran and Peschitta was חל (p.61).
- 58 This first person singular would be in harmony with the other two verbs of v.11, which are also first person singular imperfect.
- 59 See above, pp.76ff., where the emendation was also effected through the omission of 'aleph.
- 60 Luther (Biblia. Das ist: Die Gantze Heilige Schrifft, deutsch auff's new zugericht. Von Martin Luther. Wittenberg Ausgabe von 1545) attests this original reading: "das ich nicht gelestert werde", possibly through Vulgate influence. This reading is also adopted by the HOTIP Committee,

type of reverse process. In this particular case, the emendation appears to have taken place sufficiently early as to have been present in the LXX and Old Latin traditions, but not sufficiently comprehensively as to have imposed itself on those textual traditions represented by Qumran, Vulgate and Syriac.

(d) Job 34:6. Elihu, in his second speech (34:1-37), is determined to show that the ways of God are ultimately just. Therefore, it is necessary to show that Job's sin is one of arrogance and rebellion (cf. vv. 36-37). In vv.5-6, he quotes a sample of Job's protests to illustrate his point, beginning with "I am innocent and God has taken away my right" (v.5). In v.6a the MT then reads: "Concerning my right I lie (אֲכַזֵּב)", which occasions various attempts of interpretation or conjecture by commentators and other writers, in order to reconcile v.6a with either what precedes it or with what follows. To begin with, if Job protests in v.5 that he is innocent,⁶¹ how then can he say in the next breath, "I am lying", which would be both contrary to his own insistence on being innocent, as well as contrary to the point that Elihu is trying to make in this speech, namely, that Job will not admit that he is wrong.

Some commentators and translators try to ease the difficulty by rendering "I lie" as "I am accounted a liar";⁶² others render it as a rhetorical question: "Shall I lie?"⁶³ Still others resort to various types of conjectures such as "I am in pain";⁶⁴ "I am mistaken";⁶⁵ "I will be beaten"⁶⁶ and "(My judge) is cruel to me".⁶⁷ Finally, another group of

Vol. 4, p.130, and suggested in the critical apparatus of BHS (= D. Winton Thomas).

- 61 Job also protests his innocence in 9:21; 10:7; 13:18; 16:17; 27:5.
- 62 Cf. RSV and TOB; N. Peters, op. cit., p.383; G. Fohrer, op. cit., p.462; R. Gordis, op. cit., p.382; this is the interpretation of Ibn Ezra and already in an indirect way, that of the Vulgate: "in iudicando enim me mendacium".
- 63 Cf. Buber's translation and the commentaries of L. Hirtzel, Hiob, (KeH), Leipzig 1852 (2nd ed.), p.211 and K. Budde, op. cit., p.202.
- 64 Cf. A. Ehrlich, op. cit., Vol.6, p.314, followed by Driver - Gray, op. cit., p.295 (Part I) and p.253 (Part II); and Osty's translation.
- 65 Cf. B. Duhm, op. cit., p.163.
- 66 Cf. P. Szczygiel, op. cit., p.177.
- 67 Cf. J (3rd ed.).

scholars,⁶⁸ on the basis of the LXX reading,⁶⁹ see in the present MT a deliberate theological correction for an original phrase as follows:

"Concerning my judgment/right, He has lied/He lies".

Along with the testimony of the LXX, they argue that only this reading makes sense in relation to v.5b: "God has taken away my right", and to vv. 7ff., Elihu's description of Job as a "scoffer" and as one "who goes in the company of evildoers".⁷⁰

This brief survey of varying interpretations and conjectures certainly shows that the present MT is not self-evident. The conjectures may be left aside since they are without textual basis, and indeed do not always fit the context either. Only three serious possibilities remain:

- (a) the MT in the sense of "I am accounted a liar";
- (b) the MT as a rhetorical question;
- (c) the LXX reading, in which case, the MT represents an emendation for theological motives.

With regard to (a), there is the difficulty that "to lie" in the pi'el does not usually mean "to be accounted a liar"; for this, the niph'al would be required, as in Prov 30:6.⁷¹ To change the vocalisation to niph'al to obtain this sense is without strict textual foundation.⁷² There remains the interpretation of the MT as a rhetorical question, and the LXX, "He has lied". Which of these is the more likely to be authentic? It could be argued against the LXX that it is facilitating, trying to make sense of a Hebrew Vorlage that it did not understand. Yet in favour of the LXX are the two additional arguments of a theological motivation for the Hebrew, together with a phrase which not only fits the immediate context, but also the more general development of the book.⁷³

68 P. Dhorme, *op. cit.*, p.465; G. Hölischer, *op. cit.*, p.82; M. Pope, *op. cit.*, p.221 and J. Lévesque, *op. cit.*, p.581; the translations of NEB and Pléiade, and the HOTTP, Vol.3, p.114.

69 ἐφ' ὧσατο δὲ τῷ κριματί μου.

70 Job's ability to scoff, etc., would thus be well illustrated in the preceding v.6 by such a blasphemy. Cf. J. Stier, Das Buch Ijob, hebräisch und deutsch, München 1954, p.335.

71 Yet Gordis, *op. cit.*, p.386, cites Prov 30:6 in its niph'al form as a support for a pi'el interpretation of Job 34:6 with a niph'al meaning: "I am accounted a liar".

72 Only indirectly could the Vulgate be adduced to favour this vocalisation.

73 Cf. Job 19:6-7; 27:2.

To a certain extent, it seems possible to accept that Job 34:6 represents a typical theological emendation with a textual witness in its favour, which had for aim the elimination of a blasphemy on the lips of Job, by changing the verbal form. If this be so, it is more probable that the original text had a perfect form, כִּי, "he has lied", for two reasons: the LXX is aorist, and the verb in v.5b with God also as subject is perfect ("He has taken away my right").⁷⁴ Yet the fact that the MT renders a tolerable meaning makes it difficult to present this case as a theological emendation without reservations. To understand the MT as a rhetorical question is a very attractive interpretation.⁷⁵ Perhaps this case can best serve as a warning against finding too many theological emendations where they may never have existed - not unlike the process which was at work within the development of the tiqqune sopherim traditions as described in Chapter 3 above.

3. Demythologisation of Various Kinds

(a) Deut 32:8. This verse of the Song of Moses contains a particularly interesting intervention to demythologise a poetic description of Israel's coming into being as the LORD's special people. The verse speaks of "the Most High" (עֶלְיוֹן) as organising the division of peoples within their various territories, fixing their boundaries "according to the number of the sons of Israel" (MT). Verse 9 then indicates that "the LORD's portion is his people, Jacob his allotted heritage". If one remains with the MT and within a strict monotheistic perspective, the Most High is the LORD, who after having appointed the territories to the various peoples, reserves Jacob as his own special people.

However, the Qumran discoveries⁷⁶ have brought renewed attention to a

74 The HOTTP opted for a perfect form, "he has lied" interpreting v.5b as follows: "against my judgment he has lied" (i.e. he has falsified my judgment), cf. p.114. P. Dhorme, G. Hölischer, J. Lévêque and NEB opt for an imperfect form. M. Pope appears to do likewise.

75 Cf. F. Delitzsch, op. cit., p.451. "Trotz meines Rechts soll ich lügen?" See above, n.63.

76 Cf. P.W. Skehan, "A Fragment of the 'Song of Moses' (Deut 32) from Qumran", BASOR 136 (1954) 12; *idem*, "Qumran and the Present State of Old Testament Text Studies: the Masoretic Text", JBL 78 (1959) 21-25; D. Barthélemy, "Les Tiquuné Sopherim", pp.295-302 (pp.101-109 in revised edition).

different form of v.8b, "according to the number of the sons of God",⁷⁷ which is also the rendering, more or less,⁷⁸ of the LXX.⁷⁹ The reading "angels of God" is also presupposed in the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan.⁸⁰

If one were to have retained the original form of Deut 32:8, it would have caused considerable embarrassment to a mentality that was particularly sensitive to suitable theological expression. For it was open to a very definite polytheistic interpretation, namely, that when the Most High apportioned the territories according to the number of the "sons of God",⁸¹ the

77 The first fragment is described by Skehan in BASOR 136 (1954) p.12, as follows: "bene 'El or 'Elim, cf. Ps.29:1; 89:7, or 'Elohim, cf. Job 38:7; the fragment breaks off too soon for certainty as to whether 'El was the entire word". In JBL, op. cit., p.21, he adds that since then, "further fragments have filled out ... the text", which now reads in full: "bne 'elohim".

78 The "angels of God" of part of the LXX textual tradition can be seen as a partial euphemism for "sons of God", for in the Old Greek, the expressions בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים or בְּנֵי אֱלִים are rendered as "angels of God" in Gen 6:2,4 and Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7, whereas in the Psalms (29:1 and 89:7) the translation of the Greek is quite literal, "sons of God".

79 κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ὅτων θεοῦ. Cf. J. Wevers, Deuteronomium, (Septuaginta .. Vol. III,2) Göttingen 1977, p.347, for further textual details.

80 The passage from Pseudo-Jonathan represents a midrashic development in which reference to "the seventy angels" appears first, while the end of the passage speaks of "seventy souls of Israel". This conflate type of reading shows awareness of some kind of both textual forms. It probably can be considered as a witness to that attachment to the number "seventy" which resulted in further textual changes in Genesis and Exodus, see below, pp. 213ff. The full text of the paraphrase reads as follows:

When the Most High gave the world for an inheritance to the peoples who came forth from the sons of Noah, and when he divided the alphabets and tongues to the sons of men in the generation of the division, at that time he drew lots among the seventy angels, princes of the peoples, to whom he revealed himself to see the city, and at that time he established the boundaries of the peoples according to the estimation of the number of seventy souls of Israel who went down to Egypt.

For further details on the antiquity of this passage, cf. D. Barthélemy, op. cit., p.299, n.2 (p.105).

81 The Ugaritic pantheon, over which El presided, has a figure of 'seventy sons of Asherah', consort of El. Cf. C.H. Gordon, Ugaritic Literature, a Comprehensive Translation of the Poetic and Prose Texts, Roma 1949, p.35 (Text 41:VI 45), and J.B. Pritchard, ANET, p.134. There are frequent references in Ugaritic literature to a divine assembly of the gods, under the presidency of El, the head of the pantheon. Gordon, op.cit., p.132, says that the bne ha-'elohim in the prose prologue of Job, "far from being a later development, reflect the Canaanite idea of the assembly of the gods, bn ilm... so common in Ugaritic texts". Cf. also W.F. Albright, "Some Remarks on the Song of

LORD was merely one of these bne Elohim, who received Jacob as his allotted heritage, in the same way that the gods of the other nations received their heritage. Since such a possible interpretation was contrary to the most elementary principles of monotheism, it is understandable that some form of theological surgery had to be operated.

That the MT "sons of Israel" is a deliberate theological correction⁸² is beyond doubt, and understandable in the context. Even more interesting from the point of view of the methodology of such corrections, is the series of subsequent corrections to which the MT was subjected, as a consequence of Deut 32:8. These are identified and described in detail by D. Barthélemy.⁸³ The first consisted of the omission in the MT of half a verse in Gen 46:20, whereby the progeny of Manasseh by his Aramean concubine (Machir, and grandson, Gilead) and that of his brother Ephraim (Shuthelah, Tahan and grandson, Ephraim), five in all, were conveniently omitted. In Gen 46:21, the MT presents the progeny of Benjamin as belonging to the same generation, whereas the LXX enumerates them in three generations. In Gen 46:22 the original "nineteen" attested by the LXX has been emended to "fourteen" in the MT, and in Gen 46:27 and Ex 1:5, the total "seventy-five" of the LXX for both, and of Qumran for the latter,⁸⁴ is rendered in the MT as "seventy". As Barthélemy remarks, this was a "costly" manner of unifying the different passages,⁸⁵

Moses in Deuteronomy XXXII", VT 9 (1959) 339-346; and D. Barthélemy, op. cit., p.296 (102).

- 82 The following are among those writers and translators who accept that the MT is not the original one (only those marked with an asterisk explicitly explain the MT as a theological correction): A. Geiger*, op. cit. p.294; T.K. Cheyne, Job and Solomon, or the Wisdom of the Old Testament, London 1887, p.81; C. Steuernagel, Deuteronomium und Josua, (HAT), Göttingen 1900, p.116; H. Junker, Das Buch Deuteronomium, (HSAT), Bonn 1933 (2nd ed.), p.123; G. von Rad, Das fünfte Buch Mose, Göttingen 1964, p.137; P.W. Skehan, "A Fragment of 'the Song of Moses'", BASOR p.12; D. Barthélemy*, op. cit., pp.295ff.; O. Eissfeldt*, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Tübingen 1964 (3. neubearbeitete Auflage), p.927; HOTIP Committee*, Vol. 1, pp.302-303 and the translations of RSV, NEB, and J. TOB indicates that the Qumran and LXX reading is probably original and that the MT was accordingly corrected. W.F. Albright, op. cit., p.343, argues that the Qumran reading is merely a scribal error, in view of the fact "that both expressions were so common".
- 83 Cf. op. cit., pp.300-303 (106-109).
- 84 Cf. F.M. Cross, The Ancient Library of Qumran, New York 1958, photograph opposite p.101.
- 85 "La correction inverse eût été beaucoup plus économique. Il eût suffi de modifier un seul chiffre" (P.302).

so that if this more complicated manner of correcting the texts was adopted, it must have been for a serious motive. Barthélemy suggests that:

Cette raison n'est autre que le parallélisme que l'on entendait créer d'autre part avec l'hebdomécontade de la liste des peuples, et cela aux dépens du parallélisme traditionnel qui reliait celle-ci à la vieille hebdomécontade cananéenne des "Fils de Dieu". 86

This examination of the emendation at Deut 32:8 and of the repercussions it had on five other texts shows that, for some cases at least,⁸⁷ the phenomenon of theological corrections was not something which happened in a half-hearted way. To have succeeded in effecting these six inter-related corrections was hardly the work of an individual scribe, who, on his own initiative, felt that the polytheistic overtones to Deut 32:8 should be suppressed. Rather, these cases show that this activity of monitoring the text and intervening where necessary, must have ranked high among the priorities of those concerned with the protection and faithful transmission of the sacred text.

(b) The Alteration of Certain Compound Proper Names

Another form of demythologisation was effected through the suppression of "Baal" in compound proper names. Some illustrations will show how this correction was made. The occasional presence of one or more forms of the original name containing "Baal" in parallel texts or contexts of the MT, together with supporting evidence from the Versions, confirms that this type of reformulation of a proper name was indeed a deliberate intervention.⁸⁸ Closer examination of these cases shows great fluctuation in the form of the names and some inconsistencies in the adoption or otherwise of the emended texts in the different passages of the MT and Versions.

(i) Jerubbaal/Jerubbesheth

Judg 6:32 explains how Gideon received his second name, Jerubbaal,

86 Op. cit., p.302.

87 However, the care taken here is in direct contrast to the confusion and inconsistency which will be seen in the case of the Ishbosheth/Mephibosheth names, etc., which are examined below, pp.216ff.

88 Cf. Ginsburg, Introduction, pp.401-404. He links the motivation behind this type of correction to a rigid interpretation on the part of "the authoritative custodians of the sacred text" of Hos 2:17: "For I will remove the names of the Baals from her mouth and they shall be mentioned by name no more."

from his father, Joash:

Therefore, on that day he was called Jerubbaal, that is to say, "Let Baal contend against him", because he pulled down his altar.

This same name recurs a further twelve times in Judges⁸⁹ and once in 1 Sam 12:11.⁹⁰ However, the emended form, Jerubbesheth, occurs in the MT of 2 Sam 11:21. That the substitution of -besheth⁹¹ for -baal⁹² is an emendation may be demonstrated by comparison with the original form as attested in Judg 6:32 and parallels. A further confirmation comes from the LXX,⁹³ part of the MSS tradition for the Vulgate,⁹⁴ and the Syriac.⁹⁵ One may wonder at the inconsistency of the pre-Masoretic text, in leaving the first fourteen passages containing Jerubbaal uncorrected, and then to have emended one case only. One might explain this peculiarity by suggesting that the passages in Judges were left untouched because they were close enough to the event which explained the origin of Gideon's second name, a happy event, which included the destruction of Baal's altar. But then, there occurs the case of one further uncorrected form in 1 Sam 12:11, alongside the correction in 2 Sam 11:21.⁹⁶ Many similar inconsistencies will appear in the subsequent examination of other proper names also compounded with Baal.

89 Cf. 7:1; 8:29,35; 9:1,2,5a,5b,16,24,28,57. There are no textual variants in the Versions for these verses. The unusual Syriac form, Nedubaal, reappears consistently in all these passages, while the Arabic substitutes the name Gideon in all except the first passage (6:32).

90 Again there are no textual variants, apart from the substitution of the name Gideon in the Targum, Syriac and Arabic.

91 The form -besheth rather than -bosheth may be seen as a still later neutralisation of the original emendation. Inasmuch as the first secondary emendation (bosheth) represents a dysphemism, the subsequent neutralisation, at the level of the vocalised text, constitutes a euphemism.

92 Rashi, in his commentary, says: "Jerubbesheth, that is Gideon, for he engaged in strife with the bosheth, that is the baal."

93 The LXX reads 'Ιεροββαλ in v.21, and also in v.22, a passage which is absent from the MT, possibly through homeoteleuton. A variant form is attested in B, A, 'Ιεροβοδμ υἱοῦ Νήρ.

94 The MSS E (Toletanus - Madrid - s.X in Hispania), A (Legionensis, c. 960) and the Clementine edition read Hierobaal.

95 The Syriac reads Nedubaal here as in all the other passages (see n.89).

96 One might explain this difficulty as follows: 2 Sam 11:21 is corrected because it occurs in 2 Samuel, where the Ishbosheth and Mephibosheth names occur in abundance. It would appear that frequency of these baal names in 2 Samuel provoked the "correctors" to do something about them. See below, following sections.

(ii) Ishbaal/Eshbaal/Ishbosheth

The records of 1 Chronicles 8:33 and 9:39 mention Eshbaal as the fourth son of Saul. The earlier texts containing mention of this Eshbaal/Ishbaal have all been emended in the MT.⁹⁷ That these texts have been corrected, can be illustrated by comparing them with the uncorrected Chronicles form,⁹⁸ and also by examination of some variants in the LXX and other textual traditions. Examination of the various emendations imposed upon the name Ishbaal can be divided into four groups as follows:

- 1^o Those texts for which there are some textual grounds favouring an original form which contained -baal.
- 2^o Those texts for which there are no extant variants in favour of an original -baal.
- 3^o Those instances in which the name Ishbosheth/Ishbaal is present in the LXX and some other textual witnesses, but absent from the MT.
- 4^o The unusual form of "Josheb-basshebeth" in 2 Sam 23:8 for one of David's mighty men.

1^o The four occurrences of Ishbosheth in the MT of 2 Sam 2:8,10, 12,15 have some slight textual evidence for an original Ishbaal, in the minuscule MS, e₂.⁹⁹ The LXX textual tradition for these passages records a considerable variation in the orthography of Ishbosheth¹⁰⁰ in Greek, as well as a certain confusion between Ishbosheth and Mephibosheth.¹⁰¹ Pre-

97 The emended form, Ishbosheth, is attested in the MT of 2 Sam 2:8,10, 12,15; 3:8,14,15; 4:5,8a,8b,12. The question as to whether it was intentionally omitted from 2 Sam 3:7; 4:1,2 will be examined further below (pp.218ff.). In 1 Sam 14:49, this same son of Saul is called Ishvi. Cf. however, M. Tsevat, "Ishbosheth and Congeners", HUCA 46 (1975) 71-87, who attempts to argue that the bosheth element is not a secondary "dysphemism", but a divine name or epithet. He bases his hypothesis on certain name forms from Akkadian and Old Assyrian. His treatment does not take sufficient account of the existing textual variants. T. Veijola, "David und Meribaal", RB 85 (1978) 338-361 expresses a certain scepticism with regard to Tsevat's hypothesis.

98 There are no textual variants in 1 Chron 8:33 and 9:39 for the form attested there, ישבאל, "Eshbaal".

99 London, British Library, Royal 1 d. ii (cf. Brooke-McLean): ε'ισβαλ.

100 The following variations occur for 2:8, with similar types of variation in the other three verses: B j l q s ('Ιεβδσθε); A f y ('Ιεβδσθαυ); a c e n t v x ('Ιεβδυσθε); a* ('Ιεβδυσθαυ); b o c₂ (Μεμφειβδσθε); N (Μεμφειβδς). See following notes, nn.101-105.

101 Mephibosheth was the lame son of Jonathan, cf. 2 Sam 4:4; 9:6ff. See below, pp.221ff., concerning the substitution of -bosheth in place of -baal in this name also.

sumably the forms $\mu\epsilon\mu\varphi\epsilon\lambda\beta\delta\sigma\theta\epsilon$,¹⁰² $\mu\epsilon\mu\varphi\epsilon\lambda\beta\delta\varsigma$,¹⁰³ and שׁוּבַלִּי ¹⁰⁴ indicate an unintentional confusion in certain textual traditions, of Saul's son, Ishbaal,¹⁰⁵ with Jonathan's son, Mephibosheth.

In the case of the first text, 2:8, there is further textual evidence for Ishbaal in the form Ἰεσβαλ , noted in Field, *in loco*,¹⁰⁶ and in the Old Latin (*Isbalem*), while in the case of 2:12, a hexaplaric marginal reading in the MS M¹⁰⁷ attests the reading Ἰσβαλ . 4QSm^a for 2:15 presupposes Ish(bosheth) probably.¹⁰⁸ The Syriac indicates an unusual form, Ishbashul¹⁰⁹ for all four. There are some textual grounds, therefore, for the adoption of "Ishbaal" as the original form, which in turn is further supported by the consonantal forms of 1 Chron 8:33 and 9:39.¹¹⁰

2° Saul's son, Ishbosheth, is again mentioned in the MT of 3:8,14, 15; 4:5,8a,8b,12. For these seven instances there is no textual evidence for an original -baal form. The confusion between Ishbosheth and Mephibosheth mentioned above for 2:8ff. continues to appear in certain LXX MSS,¹¹¹ as well as Qumran.¹¹² The Vulgate consistently renders *Hisboseth* throughout, while the Syriac retains its peculiar form, "Ishbashul". Thus, from the

102 $\mu\epsilon\mu\varphi\epsilon\lambda\beta\delta\sigma\theta\epsilon$: b o c₂.

103 $\mu\epsilon\mu\varphi\epsilon\lambda\beta\delta\varsigma$: N.

104 שׁוּבַלִּי : cf. 4QSm^a for 4:12; Ulrich, *op. cit.*, pp.43ff. Ulrich argues that this same form can be reconstructed into the gap which occurs in 4QSm^a for 3:7; cf. *op. cit.*, p.55, and see below, pp.218-220.

105 This confusion recurs in the LXX tradition for the Ishbosheth passages to be examined in 2° and 3° below. That it was already present in some Hebrew traditions is confirmed by the Qumran reading for 4:12; see also p.44 of Ulrich, *op. cit.*, where, in a chart, he features some of the Ishbosheth and Mephibosheth (Jonathan's son) occurrences: 2:15 (I); 4:1 (I); 4:2 (I); 4:4 (M); 4:12 (I); 9:6 (M); 19:25 (M).

106 Vol. 1. p.550: $\text{o}\acute{\iota}\ \lambda\omicron\upsilon\pi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ from Codex Regius 243 (it is inaccurate for the critical apparatus of BHS to cite α' , σ' , θ').

107 Cf. the critical apparatus of Brooke-McLean *in loco*. M = Codex Coislinianus 1, Paris, B.N.

108 Only the first three consonants are extant: $\text{שׁוּבַ$; -bosheth rather than -baal, since the other extant Qumran passages containing references to either Ishbaal or Mephibaal, are already emended. Cf. 4:1,2,12.

109 Perhaps a type of conflate reading of both forms?

110 This is the option of J and the HOTTP, Vol.2, p.210.

111 For these passages the LXX MSS tradition is as follows: 3:8: $\mu\epsilon\mu\varphi\epsilon\lambda\beta\delta\sigma\theta\epsilon$, etc.; B b c o x y a₂c₂e₂; 3:14,15; 4:5,8a,8b: A B b c o x y a₂c₂e₂; 4:12: A B b c j o x y a₂c₂e₂.

112 See above, n.104, à propos of 4:12; see below, pp.219ff.(for 4:1,2).

point of view of textual criticism, there is no direct evidence for departing from the MT, apart from the indirect evidence gained from the other parallel texts of what the original form in these cases was.¹¹³ The note for translators included at 3:8 in the HOTTP report suggests a very practical solution to the problem of the inconsistencies surrounding this name:

The MT here and in 3:14,15; 4:5,8a,8b,12 should be retained on the basis of the science of textual criticism, since there are no textual witnesses for the original form, Ishbaal, see above, 2:8. However, if translators think it preferable to use one name for this same person, then the name "Ishbaal" should be adopted. 114

3^o The MT of 3:7 reads:

and may be translated as follows: ויאמר אל אבנר מדוע באתה אל פילגש אבי

Now Saul had a concubine, whose name was Rizpah, the daughter of Aiah; and he said to Abner, "Why have you gone into my father's concubine?"

The subject of the verb in 7b is obviously Ishbaal/Ishbosheth, who is mentioned in v.8ff. One would have expected a definite subject with the verb in v.7b, since Ishbaal has not been mentioned since 2:15, some twenty-three verses previously. In fact, when one turns to Qumran, one finds a hint that the text there contained a more defined subject.¹¹⁵ This subject is explicitly mentioned in the LXX as Memphibosthe/¹¹⁶ Ishbosthe,¹¹⁷ son of Saul; in a hexaplaric marginal reading in the minuscule z¹¹⁸ as ἱεσβόαλ and in the Vulgate as Hisboseth.¹¹⁹ This textual situation suggests that the

113 This typical dilemma has already been encountered above, see pp.197ff.

114 Cf. HOTTP Report, Vol. 2, pp.211-212.

115 The presence of "Saul" before "to Abner" in 4QSam^a, together with sufficient space for a name before it, indicates that the MT represents a shorter text. Ulrich, *op. cit.*, p.55, reconstructs the Qumran text after the analogy of 4QSam^d for 4:1 as having contained "(Mephibosheth, son of) Saul to Abner".

116 Cf. B b' o x c₂e₂; the other MSS attest slight variations in the orthography of Memphibosthe (cf. y a₂ and c).

117 Cf. MSS A, M and N.

118 MS z = Paris, B.N. Gr. 133. The reading: οὐ λ : ἱεσβόαλ.

119 "Dixitque Hisboseth ad Abner". The Syriac also has an explicit subject, Ishbashul. These last two do not attest "the son of Saul".

absence of a subject in the MT is not original.¹²⁰ The natural flow of the narrative requires one, and the textual evidence from the Versions and Qumran supports the reading "Ishbosheth (i.e. Ishbaal), son of Saul".¹²¹ Does the presence of the hexaplaric marginal reading, "Ishbaal" constitute sufficient textual evidence for the adoption of this reading as original in 3:7b? In the light of the adoption of Ishbaal as original above in 2:8,10, 12,15,¹²² and the observation, that for the sake of consistency, translators might adopt the same name throughout, it seems reasonable to accept that for v.7b, the original form of the verse probably read as follows: "And Ishbaal, son of Saul, said to Abner". Can one explain this omission in the MT as due to a simple error in transcription or some other accidental omission, or could it perhaps represent a deliberate omission of the "offensive" name? An attempt to answer this question may be deferred until the textual situation for 4:1,2 has been examined.

In these two cases, the MT reads as subject "the son of Saul". The Qumran text¹²³ and the LXX¹²⁴ both contain the fuller phrase, "Ishbosheth (Mephibosheth), son of Saul". This could be interpreted as a general tendency of this text tradition to make subjects more explicit,¹²⁵ yet the bald expression, "the son of Saul" occurs only in these two instances. That the MT in 4:2 is lacking an original definite name is further illustrated by the absence of a lamedh to denote possession.¹²⁶ The Qumran text attests

120 The following MSS are noted by Kennicott as reading Ishbosheth as subject: 253,257,260,264,282,283, and the margin of 249. Cf. de Rossi, 716,715 and 714 where the name was first added in, and then crossed out. The following commentators are among those who favour the re-insertion either of the full LXX reading, or just Ishbosheth/baal: O. Thénius, *op. cit.*, (1st ed.), p.137; (2nd ed.), p.151; J. Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p.157; S.R. Driver, *op. cit.*, p.189; K. Budde, *op. cit.*, p.209; W. Nowack, *op. cit.*, p.160; P. Dhorme, *op. cit.*, p.291; A. Ehrlich, *op. cit.*, p.278; J. Maynard, *op. cit.*, p.143.

121 The full expression is present in 2:8,10,12,15; 3:14; 4:8b.

122 See above, nn.113-114.

123 Cf. Ulrich, *op. cit.*, pp.42-43 and p.44.

124 The same variation between forms of Mephibosheth and Ishbosheth occurs in the LXX textual tradition here too. See above, nn.100,102-104,111,116-117. The Vulgate tradition contains a slight variant in the form of "Isbosheth" in the Clementine edition for v.1.

125 Cf. the presence of "Ishbosheth" in 3:11 and 4:7 in the LXX, but not in the MT.

126 The MT literal rendering is: "And two men, captains of raiding bands were the son of Saul,...".

the form למִיבֹשֶׁת ¹²⁷ and the LXX traditions render a corresponding $\tau\bar{\omega}$. These appear to be reasonable grounds in favour of the fuller "Ishbosheth/baal, son of Saul" for v.2, and by comparison with v.1 and its textual situation, it seems also most likely that the fuller text here too was more original.¹²⁸ Is it possible to interpret the absence of Ishbaal's name in the MT as the result of the deliberate removal of the "offensive" name in these two verses also? If this were so, one might then include 3:7 as belonging to this type of correction, but as having suffered a more drastic surgery, in that the full expression was suppressed.¹²⁹ However, in view of the complexities and numerous inconsistencies present in the history of all these texts containing Ishbaal's name, it would be impossible to demonstrate this hypothesis of a deliberate omission with certainty. In the light of the textual evidence, all that one can say with some degree of confidence is that in these three cases, 3:7; 4:1,2, the MT does not appear to be original, whatever the reason may have been for the lacunae.

⁴⁰ 2 Sam 23:8 describes one of David's heroes as "Joshebbasshebeth, a Tachemonite". The Vulgate reading, "sedens in cathedra", or the Authorised Version: "(the Tachmonite) that sat in the seat" may be accurate translations of the MT, but they do not render this obscure name any more intelligible! If one turns to the LXX, one finds a clue there as to the origin of the rather strange name in the MT. The name of this hero in the greater part of the LXX MSS tradition appears as 'Ιεβόσαβε ¹³⁰ with some typical variations in orthography in some MSS.¹³¹ This form presupposes an original יִשְׁבַּשֶׁבֶת , which has a certain superficial similarity with the MT, in

127 Cf. Ulrich, *op. cit.*, p.43

128 Among these textual traditions which attest the name of Saul's son, there are no witnesses to the original form, "Ishbaal". However, here, as in these other instances which lack textual witnesses, for the sake of clarity and consistency, translators could adopt the one name, Ishbaal, throughout. See above, n.114. The commentators listed in n.120 above also favour the fuller LXX reading for these two verses, with the exception of O. Thenius, who accepts it for v.2 only. H.P. Smith, *op. cit.*, p.284, likewise adopts the LXX for 4:2 (he rejects it for both 3:7 and 4:1).

129 Cf. J. Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, pp.160-61, who thinks that if the MT omission is deliberate, it may have been for motives of dysphemism, for these three verses.

130 Cf. MSS: B,M,N, a j l q s t.

131 A f a₂: 'Ιεβόσαβελ ; d: 'Ιοβόσαβε ;
x: 'Ιεβόσαβε ; v: 'Ιεβόσαβε .

that it contains the same consonants, with two additional beths in the MT.¹³² However, the MSS group b o c₂e₂, which for this section of Samuel represents, not the "Lucianic" recension, but the Old Greek,¹³³ attests the form Ἰεσβδάλ. This reading confirms that the "Jishbosheth" of the rest of the LXX MSS represents in fact the emended form of an original "Jishbaal", יִשְׁבַּעַל.¹³⁴

When one turns to the parallel in 1 Chron 11:11, which lists this same davidic hero, the form of the MT here is יִשְׁבַּעַם, "Jashobeam". Examination of the LXX tradition for this case also reveals that the MT is hiding an original -baal name. Among the relevant LXX variants, may be cited the following forms: Ἰεσσεβάλ (djqtz); Ἰεσσεβάλ (b); Ἰεσσαβάλ (p); Ἰσβάλ (iny) and Ἰεσβάλ (a hexaplaric marginal reading in e₂). All these forms point to an original "Jishbaal" here too.

It would seem, then, that there is sufficient textual evidence for the restoration of an original יִשְׁבַּעַל to the texts of 2 Sam 23:8 and 1 Chron 11:11, so that the anonymous "chairman" and Jashobeam can resume their original name, "Jishbaal", which was emended in two different ways in the two MT passages in order to camouflage the presence of -baal.¹³⁵

(iii) Mephibaal/Mephibosheth

1^o Jonathan's lame son is mentioned as Mephibosheth fourteen times in 2 Samuel.¹³⁶ In the four references to this same person in 1 Chronicles,

132 The present MT form can be best explained as having been contaminated by the נִשְׁבַּחַת at the end of the previous verse (7b). A similar type of contamination occurs at 21:19, some pages previously, with the name יַעֲרִי אֶרְגִּים, "Jaareoregim", where the second part of the name in fact comes from the end of the same verse. Cf. 1 Chron 20:5 for the simple uncontaminated form of this person's name.

133 Cf. D. Barthélemy, Les Devanciers d'Aquila, pp.126ff. See above, p.204f.

134 This reading is also present in the Old Latin (Iesbael) and the Syro-hexaplar.

135 This is the opinion of the commentators, etc., mentioned above in n.120, with the exception of O. Thenius, and A. Ehrlich (who proposes the name Jashobeam to be read in both texts) and with the inclusion of H.P. Smith, op. cit., p.383, and A. Schulz, op. cit., p.274. The HOTTP Committee, Vol.2, p.273 and pp.412-3 adopt "Jishbaal" as original in both instances.

136 Cf. 4:4; 9:6a,6b,10,11,12a,12b,13; 16:1,4; 19:25,26,31; 21:7.

his name appears as מֵרִיב בַּעַל, "Merib-baal"¹³⁷ or as מְרִיבָאֵל, "Meribaal".¹³⁸ The presence of the -baal form in Chronicles, in itself, suggests that the -bosheth in the name of Jonathan's lame son in the Samuel texts is an emendation of the same type as that already examined above concerning Ish-bosheth (Samuel)/Eshbaal (Chronicles).¹³⁹ Further investigation of the LXX textual variants for the Samuel passages concerned with Jonathan's son, shows that in fact this has been the case. For all fourteen instances, the MSS group b o c₂e₂ read Μερφιβαλ,¹⁴⁰ which indicates an original מֵפִיבַעַל, "Mephibaal", which means literally, "from the mouth of Baal".¹⁴¹ It is going beyond the textual evidence for the Samuel texts¹⁴² to adopt the Chronicles' form, Meribaal as original throughout. The actual provenance of Meribaal¹⁴³ is not clear. The point of particular interest remains with the baal/bosheth forms and the emendation involved.

2^o 2 Sam 21:8. The name Mephibosheth here refers to another person, namely, to the son of Saul, by his concubine, Rizpah. That the -bosheth here too is an emendation in place of an original -baal cannot be demonstrated by examination of textual evidence, for there remain no variants for an original -baal. Nonetheless, it is most probable, in the light of the textual variation illustrated above, that this text too, represents an

137 1 Chron 8:34a,34b; 9:40a.

138 1 Chron 9:40b.

139 See above, pp.216-217.

140 Further textual evidence for such an original comes from the Syro-hexaplar in the case of 4:4; 9:6a,6b,10,11,12a,12b,13; 16:1,4; and 21:7; from the Old Latin and Theodoret for 9:6a; from the marginal notes in MS j for 9:6a and 19:25 and from MS g in 9:10 and 19:25.

141 Cf. P. Dhorme, *op. cit.*, p.302, who accepts this as the original form of the name of Jonathan's son, and gives parallels for the use of "mouth" in the names of Babylonian divinities, eg.: Pû - (ilu), "bouche du dieu"; Ša-pî-Bel, "de la bouche de Bel"; Ša-pî-Marduk, "de la bouche de Marduk". A Schulz, *op. cit.*, p.47 and the *HOTTP*, Vol.2, p.215 accept this form as the original one also.

142 The following commentators indicate Meribaal as the original form of Mephibosheth's name in 4:4 and parallels in 2 Samuel: O. Thenius, *op. cit.*, (2nd ed.) p.157; J. Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p.161; S.R. Driver, *op. cit.*, p.195; K. Budde, *op. cit.*, p.216; W. Nowack, *op. cit.*, p.166; H.P. Smith, *op. cit.*, p.284f.; J.A. Maynard, *op. cit.*, p.145.

143 It is noteworthy that a certain number of the LXX MSS attest the form "Memphibaal" in each of the four Chronicles texts.

emendation, which, on the basis of indirect textual evidence, may be restored to its original form, "Mephibaal".¹⁴⁴

(iv) Eliada/Beeliada/Baaliada

In 2 Sam 5:14-16 there is a list of "the names of those who were born to him (i.e. David) in Jerusalem". Eleven names are given, among them the name אֱלִיָּדָא, "Eliada", which occurs second last in the list. This list reappears in 1 Chron 3:5-8, where Eliada is also mentioned, second last, this time in a list of thirteen. 1 Chron 14:7 also lists thirteen sons born to David in Jerusalem, but this time in place of the name Eliada, is found the name בְּעִלְיָדָא, "Beeliada".

There can be no doubt that these two names refer to the same son of David. The question remains as to whether he actually possessed two names, or whether, as in the cases previously studied,¹⁴⁵ the variation represents one and the same name in emended and unemended forms, particularly since the consonants בַּעַל (= baal) are present in the 1 Chron 14:7 text.¹⁴⁶

The possibility of someone possessing two names can be demonstrated by reference to the following personalities. Firstly, אֱלִיאִיקִים, "Eliakim", son of Josiah (2 Kings 23:34; 2 Chron 36:4) had his name changed to יְהוֹיָקִים, "Jehoiakim" by Pharaoh Neco. He is thereafter referred to as Jehoiakim (2 Kings 23:35, 36ff.; 2 Chron 36:5ff.). The theophoric element, El, in his original name was not the source of any theological difficulty, and his new name continued to have a theophoric element, the typical יהו of Yahwistic significance, in so many Jewish names.

The second personality's two names are more interesting. The son of Toi, king of Hamath, is called יוֹרָם, "Joram" in 2 Sam 8:10. In the parallel of 1 Chron 18:10, he is called הַדּוֹרָם, "Hadoram" (MT). In both cases, there is a theophoric element, the first one of Judaeian influence, possibly related to the diplomatic gesture described in 2 Sam 8:9-11. In the second

144 Concerning this type of dilemma, see above, pp.190-91.

145 Ishbaal/Ishbosheth, pp.216ff above, and Mephibaal/Mephibosheth, pp.221ff. above.

146 This is how C.D. Ginsburg, *op. cit.*, pp.402-403 interprets the differences between the two names. For him, the form in 1 Chron 14:7, Beeliada, is original, and the two parallels were altered "in a good sense" to Eliada.

instance, one can detect the presence of the god, Haddu,¹⁴⁷ in the theophoric element, הַדּוּ. To reduce these two names to one would be against the textual evidence for each passage.¹⁴⁸ The only real textual problem is whether the vocalisation in 1 Chron 18:10, הַדּוּרָם is authentic, or whether it represents an inaccurate form of the name.¹⁴⁹ The LXX reading, τὸν Ἰδουράδμ,¹⁵⁰ supported by the Vulgate, "Aduram", seems to indicate an original הַדּוּרָם, "Hadduram",¹⁵¹ a form which coincides more accurately with the name "Haddu" mentioned above.

Returning to the problem of the names for this son of David, it is possible, if not probable, that in fact he genuinely possessed two names. Examination of the textual situation for the first two occurrences of this person's name, 2 Sam 5:16 and 1 Chron 3:8, shows that there are no variants for the former¹⁵² and only one cursive in the LXX MSS tradition for the latter,¹⁵³ which is hardly sufficient to justify changing the MT in this passage. It seems reasonable to accept that this davidic son did indeed possess two names, both with a theophoric element, as in the case of the two illustrations cited above.

However, there remains the question of the original form of the name

147 A. Caquot and M. Sznycer describe how the Ugaritic storm-god, Baal, is referred to in several passages of Ugaritic texts as hd, "deux consonnes qu'on doit très probablement vocaliser Haddou, le nom même du Hadad syrien", in R. Labat et autres, Les Religions du Proche-Orient asiatique, Paris 1970, p.367. Cf. pp.369,387,414-16,421-22,436 and 438 of this same work for mention of this name in Ugaritic texts.

148 The LXX reading, Ἰεδδουράδμ, at 2 Sam 8:10 is best interpreted as an assimilation to the Chronicles' passage, rather than as conserving the "original" name. Cf. A. Malamat, "Aspects of the Foreign Policies of David and Solomon", JNES 22 (1963) pp.6-7, argues very convincingly in favour of the two names being original, each in its context. See below, nn.150-151.

149 See below, n.155.

150 The Ἰεδδουράδμ of the 2 Sam 8:10 text represents an assimilation to Chronicles, which confirms the vocalisation, הַדּוּרָם. See n.148 above.

151 Cf. A. Malamat, op. cit., p.6f. who draws attention to the existence of a similar type of double name which the last king of Hamath bore, "since he is called in Assyrian documents (from c.720 B.C.) either Ilubidi, or Jaubidi, i.e. Jeho-bidi." (p.7).

152 The doublet contained in a considerable number of LXX MSS, taken from the 1 Chron 14 list, which adds the thirteen names to the list of eleven, and in which the name הַדּוּרָם is reproduced in a deformed βααλειράδμ or βααλειράδμ etc., in no way constitutes a genuine variant.

153 MS n reads βαελιαδάδ.. (n = Oxford, Bodl. Univ. Coll.52).

בעלידע, "Beeliada" in 1 Chron 14:7. That the MT vocalisation is not original can be shown by examination of the various LXX textual forms, all of which attest an original Baal- form rather than a Beel- form.¹⁵⁴ In other words, the MT vocalisation can be interpreted as an attempt to camouflage the presence of a baal in the name of one of David's sons. The vocalisation, יְבִעְלִיָּדָע could be the result of simply transferring the vowels of יְבִעְלִיָּדָע to the offending name in an attempt to "redeem" it. The fact that it is only an emendation at the level of vowels indicates that it must have been a relatively later emendation, applied at a time when it was no longer possible to touch the consonants.¹⁵⁵

In any event, it is best to retain the separate names of this one and the same davidic son, while accepting that the form "Beeliada" in 1 Chron 14:7 represents a secondary intervention at the level of vocalisation, in an attempt to camouflage an original "Baaliada".

4. Changes which Pertain to:

- (a) God's Chosen Ones
- (b) Less Desirable People
- (c) Temple and Worship

(a) God's Chosen Ones

1^o Moses: Judges 18:30. This verse contains one of the four "suspended letters",¹⁵⁶ an irregularity in the orthography of the sacred text, for the preservation of which, certain Masoretic lists have been faithfully handed down.¹⁵⁷ The tradition concerning these "suspended" letters is certainly pre-Masoretic, and is attested in both Talmuds in the case of Judg 18:30,¹⁵⁸ in the Babylonian Talmud for Job 38:13,15,¹⁵⁹ and

154 B S c₂: βαλεγδᾶε; A e₂: βαλλιαδᾶ; N c e g h n y: βααλιαδᾶ; f i: βααλιδᾶ; b: βααδιδᾶμ; rell.: βαλιαδᾶ. The Vulgate, "Baliada", also confirms this vocalisation.

155 It is not impossible that the MT vocalisation of Hadorem in 2 Chron 18:10 in place of "Hadduram" could be the result of a similar type of transference of the vocalisation of Joram of 2 Sam 8:10, although the motivation for such an intervention would have been far less urgent. See above, n.91, concerning "Jerubbesheth".

156 תליות תליות. The four passages containing suspended letters are: Judg 18:30; Ps 80:14; Job 38:13,15.

157 Cf. Ginsburg, The Massorah, letter כ, Vol. 1, par. 230, p.37; Diqduqe Haṭṭe'amim, par. 59, et alia.

158 Baba Bathra 109b; PTal, Berakoth 13d. See below, pp.227ff.

in Leviticus Rabbah for Ps 80:14.¹⁶⁰ Comparison with one another of the role played by the suspended letter in each case makes it reasonable to suggest that they did not have a common origin. It should also be noted that in the earlier sources which mention them, they are not listed in conjunction with each other. Judg 18:30 will be examined in detail as constituting a textual emendation not unlike those of the tiqqune sopherim which may be considered as authentic.

While various origins may be suggested for the other three,¹⁶¹ it seems reasonably safe to assume that they do not involve any intentional textual emendation, and that whatever significance they may have had in pre-Masoretic circles, this was of a midrashic rather than of a textual nature.

The MT of Judg 18:30 may be translated as follows:

And the Danites set up the graven image for themselves;
and Jonathan, the son of Gershom, son of Manasseh, and
his sons were priests to the tribe of the Danites until
the day of the captivity of the land.

The preceding context describes how Jonathan became the priest of an idolatrous worship at a salary of ten shekels a year in the house of Micah. The suspended letter, nun, transforms the name "Moses" into "Manasseh", thereby attempting to disguise the fact that this descendant of Moses was a professional, idolatrous priest.

There are converging data, both in rabbinic sources and the textual history of this verse, which show clearly that the MT form (Manasseh) can only be the result of a deliberate "theological"¹⁶² emendation, having for aim the protection of Moses' good name, by no longer having it associated,

159 Sanhedrin 103b.

160 Leviticus Rabbah XIII,5. In Qiddushin 30a, the 'ayin in question in Ps 80:14 comes in for special mention as being the middle letter in the Psalter, but it is not mentioned that it is suspended. Other later sources expand the tradition reported in Leviticus Rabbah (cf. Midrash Tehillim, Midrash Shir ha-Shirim III,14 and the Aboth of R. Nathan.

161 Some would hold that they are due to mistaken majuscular letters, while others would describe them as later insertions of originally omitted (unintentionally) weak consonants. In all three cases the suspended letter is 'ayin. Cf. C. Levias, "Masorah" in JE, Vol.8, p.366; C. Ginsburg, Introduction, pp.334-341; A. Geiger, op. cit., pp.258-259.

162 "Theological" in the wider sense of insuring respect for Moses, the great religious leader of Israel. See above, p.170ff. concerning the blurring of the distinction between God and his chosen ones, in the matter of emendations.

in this verse, with that of his infamous grandson,¹⁶³ Jonathan.

The talmudic data on Judg 18:30 will be examined first, since it gives a very clear picture of how this verse was understood in rabbinic circles. In the Babylonian Talmud,¹⁶⁴ in a discussion concerning the rights of inheritance and family name, this verse comes up for clarification. The verse is cited in its MT form and the question is then asked: "Why was he the son of Manasseh? The reply given is that "Surely he was the son of Moses, for it is written, 'the sons of Moses: Gershom and Eliezer'."¹⁶⁵ The passage then explains that because he acted wickedly as did Manasseh, his descent is ascribed¹⁶⁶ to Manasseh. Then, R. Johanan, in the name of R. Simeon b. Yoḥai¹⁶⁷ makes the following statement:

From here, one may infer that corruption is ascribed¹⁶⁸ to the corrupt.

A parallel type of interpretation of Judg 18:30 is present in the Jerusalem Talmud,¹⁶⁹ reported in the name of R. Samuel bar Naḥman:¹⁷⁰

-
- 163 Ben need not necessarily refer literally to son/grandson, but more generally also to "descendant". Consequently, if the term Moses' grandson is used here, this may be understood in the broader sense of a direct descendant of Moses, who lived in the period of the Judges. Cf. Ex 18:2-3 for details concerning Moses' sons.
- 164 Baba Bathra 109a.
- 165 1 Chron 23:15. Concerning the interpretation of this passage in the Targum to Chronicles and in the Talmud, see below, p.228.
- 166 תלוא, from the verb תלה/לוא, "to suspend", a pun on the tradition of the "suspended nun". It was a very convenient and subtle change to be able to transform Moses into Manasseh, and at the same time, preserve record of the original reading, by suspending the newly inserted letter, nun. This tradition of Baba Bathra is recorded in a shorter form in both recensions of the Aboth of Rabbi Nathan (cf. ed. S. Schechter, London - Wien - Frankfurt 1887, pp.98-99 and J. Goldin, The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan, New Haven 1955, p.137).
- 167 One of the later pupils of Aqiba, of the third generation tannaim (c. 130-160). Cf. H. Strack, Introduction, p.115; W. Bacher, Die Agada der Tannaiten, Vol.2, p.113. The association of this tradition with Simeon b. Yoḥai shows that the emendation must have already been a fait accompli in the early second century A.D., at the latest.
- 168 תולין, from the same verb, "to suspend". The Tosephta to Sanhedrin 14,8 (cf. ed. M.S. Zuckerman, 1881, republished in Jerusalem 1937, p.436) contains a similar version of this tradition but in a different context, and without reference to R. Simeon b. Yoḥai.
- 169 Berakoth 13d; reproduced in Yalqut Shime'oni, Part II, par. 73, at Judg 18:30. Also incorporated into Midrash Shir ha-Shirim II,5,3.
- 170 An amora of the third generation (c. 290-320). Cf. H. Strack, op. cit., p.124; W. Bacher, Die Agada der Pal. Amoräer, Vol.1, p.518. See above,

Jonathan, son of Gershom, son of Manasseh, suspended nun.
If he were innocent, he would be the son of Moses, and if
not, the son of Manasseh.

These talmudic passages thus draw attention to a textual difficulty and to the presence of a suspended letter which caused the difficulty. In their exegesis, they introduce a pun on this suspended letter which explains the purpose of the letter, namely, to connect Jonathan's name with Manasseh, rather than with Moses. There is no doubt but that it was both a very ingenious and convenient way to deflect dishonour from Moses and to channel it to someone more deserving of this type of grandson. The difficulties of chronology and the fact that Manasseh lived some hundreds of years later were of less importance.

There is a second series of rabbinic passages which indirectly confirms that Judg 18:30 really refers to Jonathan, grandson of Moses. The MT of 1 Chron 23:15-16 gives the following list:

The sons of Moses, Gershom and Eliezer. The sons of
Gershom: Shebuel, the chief.

The Targum¹⁷¹ for this passage further explains that Shebuel is none other than "Jonathan, who was established as a false prophet, but in his old age, he repented and David appointed him as chief bursar".¹⁷² The same Targum repeats this tradition some chapters later: "Shebuel, that is Jonathan, son of Gershom, son of Moses, who returned to the fear of the LORD".¹⁷³ Both of these targumic passages, which explicitly state that the Jonathan of Judg 18:30 is the grandson of Moses, are already attested in both Talmuds¹⁷⁴ and are present in a more expanded anecdotal form in the Midrash Shir ha-Shirim.¹⁷⁵

Examination of the textual history of this verse confirms the impression gained from a study of rabbinic sources. The tradition for the suspended nun is well attested in the Masora for numerous MSS, especially in those of better quality such as the Leningrad B19^A, the Erfurt III MS, and the Aleppo and Cairo codices. The Targum, Syriac and the mainstream of the

n.167. In Midrash Shir ha-Shirim the logion is attributed to R. Jose, a contemporary of R. Simeon b. Yoḥai. Cf. W. Bacher, Die Agada der Tannaiten, Vol.2, p.181, n.4.

171 Cf. ed. R. Le Déaut - J. Robert, Targum des Chroniques, 2 Volumes, Rome 1971, Vol. 2, p.64-65 (text), Vol. 1, p.91 (translation).

172 The name "Shebuel" means "he returned to God".

173 1 Chron 26:24. Cf. R. Le Déaut - J. Robert, op. cit., Vol.2, p.71.

174 BTal, Baba Bathra 110a; PTal, Sanhedrin 30b (which renders an emended form, "Manasseh" for the Moses of 1 Chron 26:24).

175 Midrash Shir ha-Shirim.

LXX read Manasseh, thereby attesting the antiquity of the emendation.

However, a significant group of MSS of the LXX textual traditions, which may be classified as Antiochian,¹⁷⁶ and as probably representing the Old Greek for Judges,¹⁷⁷ attests a conflate reading which includes both Moses and Manasseh.¹⁷⁸ The Vulgate reads: "et Ionathan filium Gersom filii Moysi". The Old Latin likewise attests the reading, Moses.

Thus, the convergence of textual evidence in support of the original reading, "Moses", together with a strong rabbinic tradition to the same effect, constitutes impressive textual evidence in favour of Judg 18:30 being a genuine emendation. It is hardly necessary, therefore, to adduce any further argumentation from the actual context in which the passage appears.¹⁷⁹ Medieval,¹⁸⁰ modern,¹⁸¹ and contemporary¹⁸² commentators agree in general that the original reading for this verse in Judg 18:30 is Moses, and present-day translators of the Bible render accordingly.¹⁸³

176 Z g l n (o) w and the later stratum represented by d p t v, together with the Syro-hexaplar and Theodoret. Cf. the critical apparatus of Brooke-McLean; and see also N. Fernandez Marcos - A. Saenz-Badillos, Theodoreti Cyrensis Quaestiones in Octateuchum, Editio Critica, Madrid 1979, p.308: "son of Manasseh, son of Gershom, son of Moses."

177 In an unpublished (as of yet) study of the textual variants in the Book of Judges, Judith Targarona characterises the MSS K Z g l n (o) w as being an exceptional witness to the Old Greek.

178 It seems most probable that Moses represents the primitive reading and that Manasseh was added, rather awkwardly, before Gershom. See n.176 above.

179 Judg 20:28 refers to Phinehas, son of Eleazar, son of Aaron, who would be a contemporary and second-cousin of Jonathan, son of Gershom, son of Moses.

180 Rashi, in loco, says that "It was on account of respect for Moses that the nun was written, to change the name, and the nun is suspended to indicate that it is Moses and not Manasseh". Cf. also Radaq's commentary at Judg 17:7.

181 Cf. B. Kennicott, in his "Dissertatio Generalis", p.10, par. 21, of Vol.2 of his Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum variis lectionibus; A. Geiger, op. cit., p.258f.; C. Ginsburg, Introduction, p.334f.

182 Cf. K. Budde, Das Buch der Richter, (KHC), Freiburg im B. 1897, pp.124ff.; G.F. Moore, Judges, (ICC), Edinburgh 1918 (2nd ed.), p.400f.; H.W. Hertzberg, Richter, (ATD), Göttingen 1953, p.242; R.G. Boling, Judges, (AB), New York 1975, pp.265-66.

183 For details concerning the different modern translations for this verse, see Vol. 2, p.120 of the HOTTP report.

2⁰ David: 2 Samuel 5:8. Certain secondary "euphemisms" have already been examined in relation to David, namely, 1 Sam 20:16 and 25:22,¹⁸⁴ where, in both cases, it has been demonstrated that the insertion of "the enemies of" in the MT represents a theological emendation, which had for motivation the protection of David, lest the unfulfilled oaths in question rebound upon himself. The MT of 2 Sam 5:8 contains another such "euphemism", this time to avoid the suggestion that David was actually the object of hatred.

As the MT stands, it should be translated:

(Whoever would smite the Jebusites, let him get up the water shaft) to attack the lame and the blind (who) are hated (= Qere, יִנְאִי) by David's soul.

This MT reading is supported by the Targum and Syriac.¹⁸⁵ 4QSam^{a186} has a different textual form, שָׂנְאָה,¹⁸⁷ which achieves the same purpose as the MT, namely, to make David, lit. his soul, the subject of the hatred, rather than the object.

The LXX reading, τοὺς μισοῦντας τῆν ψυχὴν Δαυιδ, which has no variants, is based on an active understanding of the verb. The same is true for the Vetus Latina (omnes qui oderunt animam David) and the Vulgate (odientes animam David). This active form could be either a participial one based on the Qere (יִנְאִי),¹⁸⁸ in favour of which the LXX and the Vulgate participial forms could be invoked; or a perfect form, based on the Ketib (יִנְאִי) ¹⁸⁹ in favour of which the Old Latin (qui oderunt), and the LXX and Vulgate indirectly, could be invoked.

The Qumran text could be seen as representing another form of secondary euphemism, originating from the Ketib (יִנְאִי changed to שָׂנְאָה), parallel in meaning to that operated in the MT through the Qere and its

184 See above, pp.187-191.

185 That the MT is difficult is reflected in the non-translation of this part of the verse by W. Nowack, *op. cit.*, p.169; H.P. Smith, *op. cit.*, p.287 and J.A. Maynard in La Bible du Centenaire, *in loco*.

186 Cf. E.C. Ulrich, *op. cit.*, p.136.

187 Cf. A. Schulz, *op. cit.*, p.58, who suggests this reading in his commentary (written before the Qumran discoveries). K. Budde, *op. cit.*, p.221, had already suggested a conjectural שָׂנְאָה!

188 This is the NEB option.

189 This is the option of the HOTTP, Vol.2, p.218, and possibly that of E. Dhorme (Pléiade translation): "ceux qui haïssent la personne de David".

passive vocalisation.¹⁹⁰

As regards the choice between an original active participle based on the consonants presupposed by the Qere,¹⁹¹ or a third person qal form based on the Ketib, it seems that the balance can be tipped in favour of the latter by the following observations. Firstly, the Ketib sometimes contains original readings, a point made by C. Ginsburg,¹⁹² and already demonstrated above in the case of the tiqqun alleged to be present in 2 Sam 16:12.¹⁹³ The active (hiph'il) form of the verb in v.6b,¹⁹⁴ having the blind and the lame as subject, might also be included as an argument in favour of their being the active subject of the verb in v.8 also. However, as against this, and in favour of an original active participle, one could cite the fact that the LXX generally translates the qal perfect of נָשָׂא by an aorist, but faithfully renders the Hebrew participial forms with the corresponding Greek participle.

In any event, the variation in the textual evidence for 2 Sam 5:8, together with the implications resulting from an active reading (that David should be the object of hatred and ridicule by even the most handicapped of the Jebusite community), constitute sufficient grounds for seeing the MT Qere vocalisation and the Qumran third person feminine qal as two parallel interventions to protect David's reputation. The adoption of an active reading with the blind and the lame as subject, with David's person as the object of the hatred, removes any difficulty in translation.¹⁹⁵

190 It is interesting to note the facility in midrashic circles with which active verbs could be read as passive, and vice versa, afforded by the al-tiqre exegetical device examined above (Ch.4). For instance, the active form, "to see", in Num 20:29, is interpreted as a niph'al form in the midrashic traditions related in Rosh Hashana 3a and Ta'anith 9a. Cf. also, the other changes in verbal forms operated by means of an al-tiqre at Gen 2:1 (Shabbath 119b); 21:33 (Soṭa 10a-b); 39:1 (Soṭa 13b); Ex 23:25 (Berakoth 48b); Lev 24:18 (Baba Qamma 10b) etc. Of particular interest, although not exactly parallel, are the al-tiqre forms associated with the verb נָשָׂא in Prov 8:36, where the MT hiph'il participle ("those that hate me" is read as "those that cause me to be hated") in 'Erubin 99a, Shabbath 114a and Megilla 28a is interpreted as a hoph'al participle. See above, p.159.

191 Not surprisingly, Kennicott records a number of MSS attesting the form נָשָׂא (12 MSS).

192 Cf. Introduction, p.184; and p. 84, n.120, above.

193 See above, pp.81ff.

194 "The blind and the lame will ward you (David) off".

195 See above, n.185.

3^o Solomon: 1 Kings 10:8. The Queen of Sheba expresses wonder at Solomon's great wisdom and prosperity and exclaims:

Happy are your men (MT), happy are these your servants
who continually stand before you and hear your wisdom.

The textual evidence for this verse is divided on whether it is Solomon's "men" (אֲנָשִׁים) or his "wives" (אִשְׁתָּיו), who are thus deemed happy by the visiting queen. The MT is supported by the Targum and Vulgate, whereas the LXX, Old Latin and Syriac attest "your wives", presupposing a Hebrew Vorlage which contained אִשְׁתָּיו. The difference between the two readings can thus be reduced to the presence or absence of an initial 'aleph', and the reason for its presence or absence.

If the MT, "your men", is original, one would have to explain the LXX reading as either due to an accidental loss of the initial 'aleph', or as possibly due to influence from the following chapter which disapproves of the bad effects which Solomon's many wives had upon him.¹⁹⁶ Yet, if the LXX, etc., does represent either an accidental or deliberate variant, it is one that has left no traces of any other reading within that tradition. Moreover, to have inserted "wives" instead of "men" under the influence of the following chapter is not fully coherent, in view of the negative tenor of Ch. 11 concerning these wives, when contrasted with the Queen's approval of them in Ch. 10.

On the other hand, in favour of the LXX reading being original, one could argue as follows: it would be more in keeping with the Queen's role and dignity to refer to Solomon's wives, rather than to "his men", whoever these might have been, seeing that mention of "his servants" follows immediately in the Queen's speech. Some commentators mention the feminine touch, that the Queen should have noticed how Solomon's wives were faring.¹⁹⁷ It is easier to explain the conversion of "wives" to "men" as the result of a deliberate intervention to suppress the Queen's approval of these (אִשְׁתָּיו) women, who later turned Solomon's heart after many gods (11:4), than to find a convincing explanation of the opposite possibility. All that was

196 This explanation for the presence of "wives" in the LXX, etc., is proposed by A. Šanda, Die Blücher der Könige, (EH), Münster 1911, p.273. Other commentators who retain the MT include J. Fichtner, Das Erste Buch von den Königen, Stuttgart 1964, p.165 and M. Noth, Könige 1, (BK), Neukirchen 1968, p.203.

197 Cf. R. Kittel, Die Blücher der Könige, (HK), Göttingen 1900; J.A. Montgomery - H.S. Gehman, The Books of Kings, (ICC), Edinburgh 1951, p.217; J. Gray, 1 and 2 Kings, (OTL), London 1970 (2nd ed.), p.258.

needed was the insertion of an 'aleph' at the beginning of נשיך.¹⁹⁸ The unanimity of the LXX textual tradition is an additional argument, perhaps, in favour of its being original.

When one turns to the parallel in 2 Chron 9:7, one finds that the Hebrew, אנשיך, "your men" has considerable LXX support as well as that of the other Versions, and that only a small number of minuscules attest "your wives".¹⁹⁹ In this case, it seems reasonable to accept that the correction which was applied to the MT of 1 Kings 10:8 forms part of the original text here, and that the small number of LXX variants are the result of an assimilation of Chronicles to the LXX text of Kings. In other words, the text of 2 Chron 9:7 may be described as an original "euphemism" in all probability, whereas that of 1 Kings 10:8 constitutes a secondary one. There is not sufficient textual evidence for 2 Chron 9:7 to justify changing the MT here, especially in view of the overall more refined sensitivity of the author of Chronicles in comparison with the simpler and less theologically orthodox viewpoints of the author of Samuel and Kings,²⁰⁰ yet the option of those translators and writers who render "your wives" in this parallel passage of Chronicles also is perfectly understandable,²⁰¹ and to a certain extent, justifiable.

To the extent that this intervention to suppress, or at least to camouflage, mention of these ill-reputed wives of Solomon in a context which expressed approval of them, involved a certain protection of Solomon's reputation, this case may be included in this category as a secondary euphemism, even if the primary motivation for the correction came more from a disapproval of the wives, than from esteem of Solomon.

-
- 198 This would have been as easy as the omission of an 'aleph' in the case of 1 Sam 3:13 (an authentic tiqqun), which also has the original form well attested in the LXX, as in this case of 1 Kings 10:8.
- 199 The critical apparatus of Brooke-McLean records the minuscules b d g i y e₂ as attesting "your wives".
- 200 Cf. the HOTTP report, Vol.2, pp.311 and 455, which accepts that 1 Kings 10:8 is an emendation, but that the text of Chronicles is original. The translations of RSV, NEB, J, Pléiade and Osty follow the LXX, etc., but not those of L, TOB, and Buber, who follow the MT for 1 Kings 10:8. See the following note concerning the translations for Chronicles.
- 201 The translations of RSV, NEB, J (1st and 2nd ed.s) and Osty render "wives", but L, TOB, Pléiade and J (3rd ed.) and Buber follow the MT for 2 Chron 9:7.

⁴⁰ Elijah: 1 Kings 19:3. In v.2 of Ch.19, Elijah is sent a message from Jezabel assuring him that his life will be as the lives of the prophets of Baal that he has just slain at Mount Carmel. V.3 continues:

Then he saw (MT), and he arose and went for his life and came to Beersheba ...

There is a significant convergence of textual witnesses²⁰² which read "Then he was afraid" in place of "Then he saw". To begin with, there are two obvious difficulties with the MT, "and he saw". First of all, since the message was a verbal one, it was more a question of "hearing" than of "seeing";²⁰³ and secondly, the verb, "he saw" is rather awkward, in that it has no object. If, on the other hand, one adopts the variant reading, "And he was afraid", both of these difficulties are removed, and the sense of the verb fits the context perfectly. It would have been the most normal reaction for Elijah to have been frightened by the queen's message which was no idle threat; and his immediate reaction, in taking flight, confirms that fear for his own safety was the overriding motive. The strength of the textual evidence in support of the variant is more compelling than any argument of lectio difficilior, in favour of the MT. Furthermore, one can detect a very subtle motive behind the MT punctuation of the verb, namely, that of removing the forthright statement that Elijah, the strong "man of God", who had just liquidated the prophets of Baal, was actually terrified by the queen's message.²⁰⁴

(b) Changes which Pertain to Less Desirable People

There is one passage in particular which clearly illustrates this

202 Kennicott notes the form אָרָא for MSS 614 and primo 110; de Rossi notes MSS 291, 737, primo 1 in textu and one Targum MS, 737, which attests וָרָא . The LXX reads $\epsilon\phi\omicron\beta\eta\theta\eta$, with no variants; the Vulgate has "timuit", and the Syriac also attests this reading.

203 Cf. R. Kittel, op. cit., p.150.

204 Both I. Benzinger, op. cit., p.111, and A. Šanda, op. cit., p.442, explicitly mention this motivation underlying the MT verb, as part of their reasons for adopting the variant. Other commentators who accept the variant include R. Kittel, op. cit., p.150; C.F. Burney, Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings (first published in 1903), reprinted in New York 1970, p.229; J.A. Montgomery, op. cit., p.317; J. Fichtner, op. cit., p.278; J. Gray, op. cit., p.406; and the HOTTP, Vol. 2, p.327. The variant is also followed by the RSV, NEB, J, L, and Osty, but the MT is retained by Buber, Pléiade and the TOB.

dysphemistic practice,²⁰⁵ namely, 1 Sam 14:47, which concerns Saul.²⁰⁶ Verses 47-48 constitute a brief résumé of Saul's initial successes in fighting against his enemies round about. The general tone of this summary is favourable to Saul, apart from the end of v.47b, which reads"

And wherever he turned, he was doing evil (נַרְשִׁיעַ).²⁰⁷

Apart from the Targum, the rest of the Versions appear to have presupposed an original verb יָשַׁע, "to save", for none of them attests the idea of Saul doing evil, or being in any way guilty of misconduct. The LXX reading,²⁰⁸ οὐδὲν ἑστράφη ἐσώζετο, "Wherever he turned, he was saved", which has no variants, implies a passive form, וּבָכַל אֲשֶׁר יָפְנָה יִשָּׁע. However, the Vulgate reading, "et quocumque se verterat superabat" implies an active verb. The same is true for the Syriac active participle. These forms presuppose an original imperfect Hebrew, יוֹשִׁיעַ, "he saved", with the sense "and wherever he turned, he saved", a reading which certainly blends into

-
- 205 The texts in Hosea which refer to "Bethel" as "Bethaven", because of the idolatrous practices performed there (4:15; 5:8; 10:5) most probably represent a form of "original dysphemism", whereas the texts examined above in relation to certain proper names containing -bosheth in place of an original -baal (pp.214-222) could be described as "secondary dysphemisms". See also below, p.238f. concerning Is 19:18 and the textual problem of "The City of Destruction".
- 206 The longer MT form of 1 Sam 2:22, supported by a part of the LXX textual tradition (A N b c d g h o p q t x z c₂ e₂, with some minor textual variations), which describes "All that which his sons (i.e., the sons of Eli) were doing to all Israel and how they were lying with the women who served at the entrance to the tent of meeting" as contrasted with the shorter and more derogatory "That which his sons were doing to the sons of Israel" of another part of the LXX textual tradition (B M i m s v) and 4QSam^a, might be considered as a type of secondary expansion, having for aim to mitigate the scandal associated with these sons of Eli. Cf. HOTTP, Vol.2, p.151f. Thus, the MT may be considered as constituting a secondary euphemism rather than a secondary dysphemism, although neither emendation exactly flatters these sons of Eli.
- 207 The citation of 1 Sam 14:47 in 'Erubin 53a-b is used to contrast Saul's unfortunate character with David's favourable one, and clearly presupposes the MT interpretation. The same is true of its citation in Sanhedrin 93b in a different context. Both texts attest a tradition of comparing both characters in which Saul emerges the worse off, for having been compared with David.
- 208 Cf. also, the Vetus Latina, "conservabatur".
- 209 Cf. L. Capellus, Critica Sacra, Paris 1650, p.261, who includes this verse among a series of words where resh and waw are interchanged; he cites the LXX as having read יָשָׁע, with the observation, "sensu non minus commodo". Many commentators and translators are content to adopt the LXX passive reading in preference to the MT; cf. J. Wellhausen, op. cit., p.95; S.R. Driver, op. cit., p.91; K. Budde, op. cit., p.105; W. Nowack, op. cit., p.70f.; P. Dhorme, op. cit., p.126; H.P. Smith,

the context, and requires very little alteration from the MT.²¹⁰

That this was the original form, which was subsequently altered by deliberate intervention, presents itself as a very attractive explanation for the MT. That Saul should be described as "one who saves" would have involved two difficulties, one on a theological level, for this was an activity generally more associated with Yahweh than with humans;²¹¹ and one on an ideological level, namely, Saul's brief reign and military endeavours which ended in suicide and disaster were hardly entitled to such a description.²¹²

One could interpret the LXX passive form also as a secondary euphemism, but half-way between the original "he saved" and the MT, "he was doing evil". Perhaps the first stage in emending this verb was to read it as passive, "and he was being saved", presuming that it was Yahweh who was saving him, as in the case of David.²¹³ But then, even this emendation was much too flattering to Saul, so the MT, which involved changing an original waw to resh, achieved the desired result, "he was doing evil". Equally, it could be conceded that these two readings, "he was being saved" (LXX) and "he was doing evil" (MT), represent parallel traditions, the former having a euphemistic aim, the latter a dysphemistic aim. Thus, by way of conclusion to this examination of 1 Sam 14:47, it can be noted, that there exists here, as in other secondary euphemisms,²¹⁴ a certain variety in the

op. cit., pp.126-27 and the translations of NEB, J, L (?), Osty, Pléiade.

- 210 Without referring to the Vulgate, A. Ehrlich, op. cit., Vol.3, p.216, having cited the passive LXX form, notes: "Ungleich besser aber und auch graphisch näher liegend wäre יוֹשִׁיעַ." A. Schulz, op. cit., Vol.1, p.220, suggests this form also as original, with the observation: "Manche meinen יוֹשִׁיעַ sei eine absichtliche gehässige Aenderung". He is probably referring to K. Budde and W. Nowack, inter alios. Cf. also the HOTTP report, Vol.2, p.180, which opts for a waw consecutive form as original, יוֹשִׁיעַ. However, this form is less likely, both from the point of view of syntax and the fact that the Versions all render an imperfect form, whether active or passive. Cf. the waw consecutive form for this verb in Ex 14:30; 1 Sam 14:23; etc. (יֹשִׁיעַ). See following note for references to typical waw consecutive forms of this verb.
- 211 For instance, of the eleven occurrences of the form יוֹשִׁיעַ/יֹשִׁיעַ, eight have Yahweh as explicit subject (Ex 14:30; 1 Sam 14:23; 2 Sam 8:6,14; 1 Chron 11:14; 18:6,13; and 2 Chron 32:22); one has God as implicit subject (Job 5:15; and the remaining two have David (1 Sam 23:5) and Shamgar (a minor judge, Judg 3:31) as subject.
- 212 See above, n.207.
- 213 Cf. 2 Sam 8:6,14 and the parallels in 1 Chron 18:6,13.
- 214 See above, pp.184-87 (2 Sam 12:14); pp.230-31 (2 Sam 5:8) and below, pp.238ff (Is 19:18).

traditions concerning the form of correction which was applied to the original text.

(c) Changes which Pertain to Temple and Worship

Under this heading two further instances of secondary euphemism, and indeed also of secondary dysphemism in the latter case, may be examined, one having to do with the Temple (1 Kings 9:8) and one concerned with the name of a city in Egypt (Is 19:18), which was given a less than propitious title, "City of Destruction".

1⁰ 1 Kings 9:8. After Solomon had completed the construction of the Temple, he received a second apparition of the LORD, in which he was assured of divine protection if he remained faithful to the LORD (9:1-5); but if he were to turn aside, (v.6), destruction would soon follow (v.7) and:

This house will become lofty (לְעֹלָה), everyone passing by will be astonished and hiss ... and ask, "Why has the LORD done this?"

There is an obvious difficulty arising from "lofty,exalted" in this context of threat and destruction. That the original text contained "And this house will become a ruin (לְעֵיִן)" is very likely, in that it commands a certain textual support in its favour from some of the Versions,²¹⁴ and certainly fits a context of threat, in which the continuation of the narrative describes the astonishment of the passerby and the explanation for the destruction. It was probably this very strong statement concerning the ruin of the Temple that occasioned the need for a correction here,²¹⁶ although Micah's equally strong prophecy of ruin escaped untouched.²¹⁷

The LXX textual tradition follows the MT, for the greater part, in attesting the correction; yet a group of minuscules²¹⁸ indicates some

215 The Old Latin (et domus haec erit deserta) and Syriac (and this house will become a ruin) directly attest this reading, while the conflate reading of the Targum presupposes it: וְהָיָה עֵלְיוֹ יְהִי חֲרִיבֵי, "(and this house) which was lofty, will become ruined". The Vulgate reading, "et domus haec erit in exemplum", inasmuch as it seems to presuppose a form לְעֵיִן, exemplum, indirectly attests the original too.

216 It would have been a simple matter to invert the order of the first two consonants and to change the second yodh to waw. Commentators who accept that the original text had "will become a ruin" include R. Kittel, op. cit., p.82; A. Šanda, op. cit., p.247; J.A. Montgomery, op. cit., p.204; J. Gray, op. cit., p.236, the translations of RSV, NEB, L, Osty, Pléiade and the HOTTP, Vol. 2, p.310.

217 Mic 3:12; "Jerusalem shall become a ruin" (= Jer 26:18).

218 The Antiochian text (b o c₂e₂) and a₂.

attempt to make more sense of this strange reading in a context of destruction. Their reading, which attests the definite article before "lofty", gives the following meaning: "And this exalted house".²¹⁹ The conflate reading from the Targum, "And this house which was high, will become a ruin", is interesting in that it is unusual for the Targum to differ from the MT in secondary euphemisms.²²⁰ It is the Targum too, which provided a key to the interpretations of Rashi and Radaq who presuppose the sense of a "ruin" in their commentaries.

The parallel of 2 Chron 7:21 attests "lofty" (עליון), but has incorporated this reading more naturally into the text by means of a relative pronoun: "And this house which was lofty". This fact, together with a more unified textual tradition in the Versions,²²¹ probably indicates that the emendation in Kings had already taken place, so that the "lofty" in Chronicles is original there. One has here a textual situation parallel to that of 1 Kings 10:8 and its parallel of 2 Chron 9:7,²²² where the former constitutes a secondary euphemism and the latter an original euphemism. Such texts provide a useful guideline for identifying the period and mentality in which this type of emendatory initiative took place.²²³

²⁰ Isaiah 19:18. Ch. 19:1-15 of Isaiah contains an oracle against Egypt in typical prophetic style; vv.16-25 consist of a prose passage predicting a conversion of Egypt and its reconciliation with Assyria and Israel. This latter passage is generally considered to be of later origin and presupposes a Jewish presence in Egypt. The universalism of this passage, which accords the same privileges to Egypt and Assyria as to Israel (v.25), indicates that this prose passage cannot be earlier than Deutero-Isaiah at least. V.18 describes how five cities in Egypt will speak the language of Canaan and will swear allegiance to the LORD of hosts. "One of these will be called 'The City of Destruction' (MT: עִיר הַהָרָס)".

219 Some commentators opt for this reading, which requires too much surgery to the Hebrew text for it to be original, apart from being facilitating. Cf. I. Benzinger, op. cit., p.66; M. Noth, op. cit., p.194f. and J's translation.

220 The mentality which inspired emendatory initiative in the MT is similar in outlook to the targumic approach. See below, nn.224 and 231.

221 The reading ἐρηκουσθήσεται (b i y e₂) possibly represents influence from the Syriac and Targum and the general context.

222 See above, pp.232ff.

223 See above, p.68f. and below, pp.241-242.

That this reading of the MT²²⁴ represents a secondary dysphemism in place of an original "City of the Sun" (עִיר הַחֶרֶס) is practically certain. First of all, there is considerable textual evidence attesting this latter reading. For its Hebrew form some MSS of Kennicott²²⁵ may be cited, in addition to 1QIs^a.²²⁶ Within the LXX tradition,²²⁷ the readings of Codex Sinaiticus²²⁸ and Symmachus²²⁹ should be noted. The Vulgate reads "civitas Solis".²³⁰ The Targum represents a conflate reading,²³¹ "The City of Beth Shemesh, which is destined for destruction". Finally, the quotation of this verse in the Talmud,²³² presupposes this targumic tradition of a conflate reading.

Secondly, as regards the background to this "original" reading, there is evidence of a Jewish temple in Heliopolis,²³³ which, according to M. Delcor, is not to be confused with that of Leontopolis which was in the same province.²³⁴ The existence of a temple in Heliopolis would naturally give rise to suspicion, if not indeed to a more hostile disapproval on the

-
- 224 The MT is only directly supported by the Syriac, and rendered in a transliterated form by Aquila and Theodotion (αρες). Inasmuch as the Targum represents a conflate reading (see n.231 below), it indirectly attests the MT.
- 225 MSS 160, 228, 264, 271A, 283A, 288, 300, 320^{mg}, 396, 423, 569, primo 99, 180, 524, 571; forte 570.
- 226 Cf. E.Y. Kutscher, *op. cit.*, p.116.
- 227 See p.240 following, concerning the main LXX textual tradition which reads Πολις-ασεδεκ, "City of Justice".
- 228 ασεδ (ηλίου).
- 229 "civitas ηλίου" according to Codex Marchalianus, and the Syro-hexaplar.
- 230 J. Ziegler, *Isaias*, Göttingen 1939, p.191 notes that Jerome says: "quidam interpretantur in solem, et alii in testam transferunt uolentes uel Heliopolim significare uel Ostracinem" (Onomastikon, p.39, ed. E. Klostermann).
- 231 קרחא בית שמש דעתידיא למחרב
- 232 Menahoth 110a: "What is meant by the City of Heres? As R. Joseph rendered it in Aramaic: 'The City of Beth Shemesh, which is destined for destruction will be said of one of them'. But whence do we know that Heres (חרס) signifies the Sun? It is written, 'Who commands the sun (חֶרֶס) and it does not rise' (Job 9:7)."
- 233 Cf. M. Delcor, "Le Temple d'Onias en Egypte", *RB* 75 (1968) 188-205, for documentation concerning Jewish activity in the region of Heliopolis in the time of Onias IV (c.160 B.C.). See pp.201-202 of this article in particular, concerning Heliopolis.
- 234 Cf. *op. cit.*, p.202.

part of the Jewish authorities in Jerusalem. This provides a very cogent motivation for interpreting the MT as a very clever form of deliberate dysphemism,²³⁵ for not only does this emended MT reading remove the offending name,²³⁶ but with the mere substitution of two very similar consonants, ה and ח, which were often confused anyway,²³⁷ it succeeds in replacing it with an ominous name, "City of Destruction".

The reading of the main LXX textual tradition, ἱερός-ἡλιούπολις, most likely represents an attempt to rehabilitate this temple of Heliopolis.²³⁸ It is not possible to determine with certitude whether this tradition was independent of the MT secondary dysphemism, or whether it represents a direct response to it,²³⁹ but in either event, it can be described as a secondary euphemism in relation to the original "City of the Sun".²⁴⁰

5. Conclusions

In the course of the latter part of the preceding chapter, and throughout the entire present chapter, a number of texts have been examined, for which there are reasonable grounds for concluding that the MT represents an emended text, and that the emendations were undertaken for theological or "semi-theological" motives.²⁴¹ No text has been deemed emended

-
- 235 Cf. M. Delcor, *op. cit.*, p.201; E.Y. Kutscher, *op. cit.*, p.116; and the HOTTP, Vol.4, p.45, all of whom explicitly see the MT form as a tendentious alteration and opt for the form, "City of the Sun", as original. Others who adopt "City of the Sun" as original include H. Wildberger, *op. cit.*, p.727 (but in his commentary, p.729, he seems to prefer remaining with the MT) and the translations of RSV, NEB, J, Buber and Pléiade.
- 236 The name Heliopolis was probably linked to the Egyptian Sun-god, Ra.
- 237 Cf. Kutscher, *op. cit.*, p.116, who lists instances of confusion between these letters in the 1QIs^a Scroll.
- 238 "City of Justice" occurs in Is 1:26 in relation to Jerusalem. To have applied this name to Heliopolis was almost tantamount to putting Heliopolis on the same footing as Jerusalem. Cf. Delcor, *op. cit.*, p.201.
- 239 Cf. M. Delcor, who, in speaking of the LXX and MT variants, characterises them as follows: "aussi bien peut-on percevoir, dans ces variantes textuelles, tantôt le point de vue d'un Alexandrin favorable au nouveau sanctuaire, et tantôt le point de vue d'un Palestinien orthodoxe" (p.201).
- 240 Both Geiger and Ginsburg recognise that the MT represents a later correction, but their option for the LXX (City of Justice) as the original reading cannot be accepted in the light of the full evidence. Cf. Geiger, *op. cit.*, p.79 and Ginsburg, *op. cit.*, p.404.
- 241 Concerning the nature of "semi-theological" corrections, see pp.170ff. above.

without some textual evidence, whether direct,²⁴² or indirect.²⁴³

In the light of the previous pages, the following general observations may be made, by way of concluding this examination of theological corrections.

1^o Apart from the Targum, which faithfully reproduces the MT in almost all²⁴⁴ the emendations listed above, there appears to be no predictable pattern among the other textual sources regarding either emendation or original text. Sometimes Qumran attests the emendation,²⁴⁵ sometimes the original text.²⁴⁶ The same observation is valid for the Vulgate, etc.

2^o Perhaps the next most consistent feature is that there appears almost always²⁴⁷ some hint of the original, or at least a variant in some way related to the existence either of the original reading or of the emendation, in one or more branches of the Septuagint traditions.

3^o The fact that the LXX textual tradition represents such a fluctuation, from being entirely in line with the emendation in the case of Ex 23:15 and parallels, to representing the original text very strongly in such cases as 1 Sam 2:17 and 1 Kings 10:8 and the two tiqqunim, 1 Sam 3:13 and Job 7:20, as well as attesting many intermediate situations for the other cases, gives a general framework for dating this phenomenon²⁴⁸ as coinciding approximately with the last two hundred and fifty years, B.C., onwards. The presence of the Ishbosheth/Mephibosheth names in Qumran like-

242 Direct textual evidence includes readings from Qumran, Hebrew MSS collections and the Versions.

243 Indirect textual evidence for a given case consists of other biblical parallels which have some direct textual evidence for the original, together with good contextual indications that the MT represents an emendation.

244 The Targum for Ps 42:3 is the most notable exception, along with the Fragmentum Targum for Ex 34:20. In Deut 32:8 (Pseudo-Jonathan), 1 Kings 9:8 and Is 19:18, the existence of a conflate reading shows how the Targum tried to "serve two masters", both MT and the original text.

245 2 Sam 4:1,2,12 attest the -bosheth emendation. See above, n.112.

246 1 Sam 2:17; Is 19:18; 48:11; Deut 32:8 and Zech 2:12.

247 In the case of Ex 23:15 and parallels, the LXX tradition as a whole attests the emendation.

248 However, it must be borne in mind that each case has its own textual history, and that at times, the presence of the MT reading in some of the LXX traditions may represent later recensional activity rather than evidence that its Vorlage already contained the emended text.

wise supports this dating, yet the confusion and lack of consistency noted above²⁴⁹ in the LXX traditions concerning the emended and unemended forms of these names shows that it is very difficult, if not impossible, to localise these corrective activities more precisely. A further important anchor in dating this activity is provided by certain texts in Kings,²⁵⁰ when compared with their parallel in Chronicles. The fact that the emended text of the former appears as original in the latter shows that, for these cases anyway,²⁵¹ the emendation was already present in certain Hebrew textual traditions when Chronicles was being put together, even if the LXX Vorlage for Kings in one case is different from the MT,²⁵² and attests the original reading.

4^o The earlier emendations were generally concerned with consonantal changes,²⁵³ or with the addition or omission of one, or sometimes more, words. The more recent corrections were confined to the vocalisation, as for instance in the case of 1 Kings 19:3, where the presence of the original reading in the entire textual tradition apart from the Targum, constitutes an additional argument in favour of the relatively recent origin of the emendation.²⁵⁴

5^o The foregoing analysis of the textual evidence for the various emendations has been supplemented in each case by taking into account both the motivation for an emendation and the literary and grammatical context. Only in the case of Job 34:6,²⁵⁵ has it been necessary to express reservation regarding the existence of a theological correction. In this case, it

249 See above, pp.214f. concerning Jerubbaal/Jerubbesheth; pp.216-220 concerning the Ishbaal/Ishbosheth names, and pp.221-223 concerning the Mephibosheth names.

250 Cf. 1 Kings 9:8 and 10:8 and their parallels in 2 Chron 7:21 and 9:7 respectively. See above, pp.237 and 232.

251 Yet, in certain of the -baal proper names, one finds the unemended form in Chronicles (cf. 1 Chron 8:33; 9:39; concerning Ishbaal, and see 1 Chron 8:34a,34b; 9:40a,40b concerning Mephibaal (Meribaal) alongside some emended forms (Jashobeam in 1 Chron 11:11 and, to a lesser extent, Beeliada in 1 Chron 14:7), while their respective parallels in Samuel all contain -bosheth.

252 1 Kings 10:8. In the case of 9:8, the main LXX tradition follows the MT, but there is a variant which struggles to make sense of the correction, see above, p.237f.

253 With the probable exception of Ex 23:15 and parallels, which were changes in vocalisation only, but probably very ancient ones.

254 Cf. also 1 Chron 14:7 (Beeliada/Baaliada).

could be argued that it was pure coincidence that the facilitating LXX reading, together with a possible theological motive (resulting from the variant, not necessarily its cause) fortuitously combined to give the appearance of a secondary euphemism.

6^o Finally, it must be repeated, that these pages represent an investigation into certain types of theological emendation, with the primary aim of illustrating that the phenomenon of tiqqune sopherim is not confined to the three authentic ones contained in the traditional lists. It does not claim to be exhaustive. With the on-going publication of the remaining Qumran and similar texts, together with an increasing number of critical editions of the early Versions being made available, it should be possible to detect further traces of this corrective initiative.²⁵⁶

255 See above, pp.209-211.

256 Some further secondary euphemisms may be detected among the variants between $\eta\eta\kappa$ and $\eta\eta\kappa/\eta\eta\kappa$ etc., at Gen 22:13; 2 Sam 7:23; 1 Chron 17:21; Ez 37:16,20; etc., and in the $\eta\eta\kappa/\eta\eta\kappa$ variation in 2 Sam 12:30; 1 Kings 11:7; 2 Chron 20:2; Jer 49:1,3; Zeph 1:5 and possibly also in Amos 1:15. See also the textual variations for Deut 32:42; Is 65:1 and Jer 23:33,39.

C H A P T E R 7

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The chief purpose of this study has been to examine the origins, nature and usefulness of the tradition of the Tiqqune Sopherim. A second main centre of interest has been an attempt to identify scribal emendatory activity, over and above that recorded in the traditional lists. And finally, since the tiqqune sopherim were understood to be theological in motivation, this fact has necessitated an examination of the use of euphemism and related idioms in biblical, talmudic and midrashic literature.

- 1^o The origins, nature and usefulness of the tiqqune sopherim traditions

(a) Origins. An analysis of the main sources attesting the tradition of tiqqune sopherim has shown that the origins and development of this tradition are very complex.¹ Not only are there almost as many variations in the number of cases, in the order in which they are listed and in the precise nature of a given emendation, as there are extant lists, but there is also a certain latent ambiguity as to whether this tradition is concerned with lists of "emendations" (tiqqunim) or "euphemisms" (kin-nuyim).² An attempt has been made to identify the earliest extant form of the tradition as that present in the Siphre on Numbers at 10:35,³ where an initial list is included by way of an expansion to a certain understanding of Zech 2:12. This list is reproduced in various other sources, gaining momentum with the passage of time. In the Mekhilta of Rabbi Ishmael eleven cases are listed in all; in the Tanḥuma edition, seventeen, and in the full-blown Masoretic lists the classical figure of "eighteen" is achieved and more or less maintained, even if the individual eighteen cases listed vary from list to list.

In an Excursus devoted to the examination of another rabbinic tradition concerning the "Passages in the Septuagint which the Sages changed

1 See above, Ch. 2, pp.25-59.

2 See above, p.18 and pp.68ff.

3 See above, pp.25-31.

for King Ptolemy",⁴ a similar type of fluctuation has been noted in the sources attesting the passages in question. The number varies from "thirteen" in the Mekhilta of R. Ishmael and PTal, Megilla 7ld, to "fifteen" in BTal, Megilla 9a, to "ten" in al-Qirqisani and Tanḥuma (even if the latter actually list "fourteen" passages) and finally, to "eighteen" in Shemoth Rabbah V,5, but without any list included in this instance.⁵

The confusion and variation in the tiqqunim lists, paralleled with this other tradition which attests a similar type of fluctuation, but where it is possible to verify to some extent the accuracy, or rather the inaccuracy⁶ of this tradition by examining the LXX passages in question, cast an initial doubt on the reliability of the tiqqunim tradition and its lists.

A further source of confusion associated with these lists is that for a period of their transmission, they were handed down under the guise of a list of "euphemisms", which was possibly intended to convey the impression that Scripture had not been tampered with, but had always been written euphemistically. It was not until a later period that the use of tiqqun to describe this tradition becomes frequent,⁷ yet the memory of what had actually happened to certain verses was never totally lost, and is attested in certain sources earlier than the Tanḥuma and al-Qirqisani.⁸ This tiqqunim interpretation is certainly latent, if not even explicit à propos of Zech 2:12 as early as the Mekhilta of R. Simeon b. Yoḥai.⁹

(b) The Nature of the Tiqqune Sopherim. With such complexity attending the origin and development of the lists, it is not surprising to discover that the greater number of cases listed are not genuine emendations, and indeed in most cases, not even genuine euphemisms. Each case has been carefully examined¹⁰ in the light of textual evidence, contextual and grammatical considerations, and in view of whatever rabbinic traditions exist in relation to a given verse. Only in three of the nineteen cases examined

4 See above, pp.131-137.

5 See the chart on p.132.

6 See above, pp.133-135.

7 See above, pp.33-41.

8 See above, pp.37-38.

9 See above, p.62-63, nn.14-15.

10 See above, pp.61-129.

above,¹¹ has it been possible to identify a genuine emendation on the basis of textual evidence as well as arguments based on an analysis of the context, etc. The remaining greater number of tiqqunim have been shown to be unauthentic as "emendations".

In most cases, it has been possible to identify the origin of the tiqqun status as having been in some way related to typical midrashic traditions of interpretation, in particular to the many types of exegesis founded on the al-tiqre exegetical device,¹² and to a well-developed sensitivity to various uses of euphemism and other substitute expressions.¹³ In many cases, other rabbinic traditions, whether present in the Talmud and/or Midrashim, have helped to throw light on how these cases became tiqqunim. It is within such an atmosphere, therefore, that this tradition of tiqqune sopherim came to birth, containing, on the one hand, a modicum of truth, but surrounded by layers of midrashic expansion.

One is forced, therefore, to conclude that indeed this tradition belongs more to Midrash than to Masorah,¹⁴ while maintaining nonetheless, that with regard to its basic intuition, it does preserve a historical fact. There were genuine scribal emendations, and the lists preserve the memory of this in a very modest number among the "eighteen".

(c) Their Usefulness. From the point of view of textual criticism, the usefulness of the tradition lies precisely in drawing attention to the fact that there were genuine scribal emendations. If there never had been a rabbinic tradition of tiqqune sopherim, it would be somewhat more difficult to develop a case for the various other theological corrections to which the MT was subjected at various stages in the history of its transmission. Such was the respect for the sacred text, that the rabbis would never have invented such a tradition unless it had been based on some historical foundation. However, because this emendatory initiative is hidden in an apparently "comprehensive" and neat list that has a certain objective standing in that it features in a number of Masoretic lists, the tradition tends to be more misleading than helpful. In other words, as a tradition, since so much of

11 See above, pp.61-69 for Zech 2:12; and pp.76-81 for 1 Sam 3:13 and Job 7:20.

12 See above, Ch. 4, pp.139-166.

13 See above, pp.171-178 in particular, and pp.167-196 in general.

14 See above, p.23, n.30.

its content is untrustworthy, it is being proposed here that it should be examined with much more critical eyes than heretofore.¹⁵

Consequently, it would be more helpful in critical editions of the Hebrew Bible, such as BHK and BHS, if the siglum, tiq soph, had been omitted from the "Sigla et Compendia" in the Prolegomena¹⁶ of both, and from the individual footnotes in the various relevant verses,¹⁷ together with the "supposed original readings". In the case of the few authentic emendations, there is sufficient textual evidence, from more worthy and objective sources for the original, to include in the critical apparatus, without having recourse to tiq soph, even if, in these three cases, the siglum would have some value.

Thus, one of the practical conclusions to this study may be expressed negatively as follows: the traditional lists of "eighteen scribal corrections" attested in certain Masoretic lists should not be cited as representing trustworthy information concerning the "original unemended" forms of the "eighteen" verses in question, and consequently, should not be cited in the critical editions of the Bible, even for the sake of three authentic ones. It is almost easier, and less confusing, to provide the original readings for these few cases from textual sources, than to have to rely on a tradition which contains more error than truth as regards scribal emendatory initiative.

²⁰ However, if the greater number of tiqqune sopherim may not be accepted as recording genuine fact, the existence of some few genuine cases draws attention to the second main element in this study, namely the attempt to identify scribal emendatory initiative in the Bible other than that which is genuine within the tiqqunim sources. It has been possible to assemble and typify a certain number of textual cases where the evidence suggests that the MT represents a text emended for theological or semi-theological motives.¹⁸ In all these instances, no text has been deemed emended without some textual evidence, whether direct or indirect.¹⁹ Furthermore, by

15 See above, p.19f.

16 For BHK, p.xliii; for BHS, p.xlviii.

17 See above, p.17, n.3.

18 See above, Ch.6, pp.197-243.

19 See above, p.241, nn.242-243.

examining a number of different textual problems of this nature, it has also been possible to provide some framework within which to date this initiative. It has been suggested that scribal emendations (including the three authentic tiqqunim) can be located within the last two hundred and fifty years B.C., to about 70 A.D. for the consonantal text,²⁰ and somewhat later still for certain changes in vocalisation only.²¹

3^o Since the tiqqune sopherim were understood to be emendations undertaken for theological motives, and since, for part of their transmission, they were handed down under the more general term of kinnuyim, it has been necessary to study various aspects of the use of euphemistic and similar expressions in biblical and rabbinic literature, and in particular, to try to distinguish between those expressions which are original or congenital to a given text (original euphemisms) from those which have been superimposed upon a given text at a later period, so as to render that text more in keeping with later theological language (secondary euphemisms).²² By developing a set of terms to cover these various nuances, it has been possible to differentiate more consistently than heretofore, to what extent "euphemism equals emendation", and to what extent this equation may not be maintained.²³

In the course of the investigation, it has been noted that a given euphemistic device may be "original" in one body of literature, but "secondary" in another.²⁴ It has also been noted that some of the instances of original euphemism in the Bible (cf. Jer 2:11 and Ps 106:20) were destined to be converted into tiqqunim,²⁵ a fact which illustrates once again how close and intertwined are the relationships between tiqqunim as a whole, and "euphemisms", whether original or secondary.

If their contribution to the science of textual criticism in the strict sense of the word may be termed minimal if not misleading, nevertheless, the study of the tiqqune sopherim brings to light many positive elements in filling out the background to the atmosphere in which the sacred text was both protected and interpreted for succeeding generations.

20 See above, p.241f.

21 See above, p.242.

22 See above, pp.167-171, in particular, and Ch.5 in general.

23 See above, p.168, n.4 and p.195f.

24 See above, pp.183-191.

25 See above, pp.182-183.

Seen in this perspective, the actual extent of emendatory initiative undertaken by the "scribes" was considerably restrained, and one must continually marvel at the overall fidelity and care taken by those to whom we are indebted for the transmission of the biblical text.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

A. Textual Sources1. Biblical Texts

- BAILLET M. - MILIK J.T. - de VAUX R. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert III. Les Petites Grottes de Qumrân. Oxford 1962.
- BARTHELEMY D. - MILIK J.T. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert I. Qumran Cave I. Oxford 1955.
- BENOIT P. - MILIK J.T. - de VAUX R. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert II. Les Grottes de Murabba'ât. Oxford 1961.
- BROOKE A. - McLEAN N. - THACKERY H. The Old Testament in Greek. Cambridge 1906 ... (incomplete).
- BURROWS M. The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery. 2 Volumes, New York 1950.
- DIEZ MACHO A. Neophyti I, Targum Palestinense, MS de la Biblioteca Vaticana. 5 Volumes, Madrid - Barcelona 1968-78.
- ELLIGER K. - RUDOLPH W. Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Stuttgart 1967-77.
- FIELD F. Origenis Hexapla. 2 Volumes, Oxford 1875 (reprinted in Hildesheim 1964).
- GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN M. Aleppo Codex. Provided with masoretic notes and pointed by Aaron ben Asher. Jerusalem 1976.
- ben HAYIM IBN ADONIYA J. Biblia Rabbinica. Venice 1525 (reprinted in Jerusalem 1972).
- HOLMES R. - PARSONS J. Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum Variis Lectionibus. 5 Volumes, Oxford 1798-1827.
- KENNICOTT B. Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum, cum variis lectionibus. 2 Volumes, Oxford 1776-80.
- KITTEL R. - KAHLE P. Biblia Hebraica. Stuttgart 1937 (3rd ed.).
- de LAGARDE P. Librorum Veteris Testamenti Canonicorum Pars Prior Graece. Göttingen 1883.
- LE DEAUT R. - ROBERT J. Targum des Chroniques. 2 Volumes, (AnBibl), Rome 1971.
- LOEWINGER D.S. Cairo Codex. The earliest extant Hebrew Manuscript. Written in 895 by Moshe ben Asher. 2 Volumes, Jerusalem 1971.
- van der PLOEG J.M.P. - van der WOUDE A.S. Le Targum de Job de la Grotte XI de Qumrân. Leiden 1971.

- RAHLFS A. Septuaginta. 2 Volumes, Stuttgart 1935.
- de ROSSI J. Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti. 4 Volumes, Parma 1784-98.
- SABATIER P. Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae seu Vetus Italica. 2 Volumes, Remis 1743.
- SPERBER A. The Bible in Aramaic based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts. 5 Volumes, Leiden 1959-73.
- STENNING J. The Targum of Isaiah, edited with a Translation. Oxford 1953 (2nd ed.).
- STRACK H. The Hebrew Bible - Latter Prophets. The Babylonian Codex of Petrograd. Petrograd 1876 (reprinted in New York 1971).
- ULRICH E.C. The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus. (HSM 19), Harvard 1978.
- WALTON B. Biblia Sacra Polyglotta. 6 Volumes, London 1655-57.
- WEBER R. Biblia Sacra, juxta vulgatam versionem. 2 Volumes, Stuttgart 1969.
- YEVIN I. Geniza Bible Fragments with Babylonian Massorah and Vocalisation. 5 Volumes, Jerusalem 1973.
- ZIEGLER J. - WEVERS J. Septuaginta ... Göttingensis. Göttingen 1926...

2. Rabbinic Texts

- BACHER W. Abulwalid Merwan ibn Ganah, Sepher ha-Schoraschim. (Tradirt von Jehuda Ibn Tibbon). Berlin 1896.
- BAER S. - STRACK H. Didgude Hatte'amim. Leipzig 1879 (reprinted in Jerusalem 1970).
- BIESENTHAL J. - LEBRECHT F. Sepher ha-Shorashim. Dawid Qimhi. Rabbi Davidus Kimchi Radicum Liber sive Hebraeorum Bibliorum Lexicon. Berlin 1847.
- BUBER S. Midrasch Tanhuma. Wilna 1885.
- Midrasch Tehillim (Schocher Tob). Wilna 1892.
- Midrasch Shemuel. Cracow 1893 (reprinted in Jerusalem 1965).
- Yalqut ha-Machiri zu Psalmen, von R. Machir ben Abba Mari. Berdyczew 1899.
- DIAZ ESTEBAN F. Sefer 'Oklah we-Oklah. Collección de listas de palabras destinadas a conservar la integridad del texto Hebreo de la Biblia entre los Judios de la edad media. Madrid 1975.
- EPSTEIN J.N. - MELAMED E.Z. Mekhilta d'Rabbi Simon b. Jochai. Fragmenta

in Geniza Cairensi reperta digressit. Jerusalem 1955.

FINKELSTEIN L. Siphre ad Deuteronomium. Berlin 1939.

FISCH J. Midrash Haggadol on the Pentateuch. Numbers. Volume 1, London 1957.

FRENSDORFF S. Das Buch Ochlah w'Ochlah. Hannover 1864.

FRIEDLAENDER J. - KOHN J. Maase Efod, Einleitung in das Studium und Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache von Profiat Duran. Vienna 1865.

FRIEDMANN M. Siphre debe Rab, der Älteste halachischer und haggadischer Midrasch zu Numeri und Deuteronomium. Vienna 1864 (re-printed in New York 1948).

---- Mechilta de Rabbi Ishmael, der Älteste halachischer und haggadischer Midrasch zu Exodus. Vienna 1870.

---- Pesikta Rabbati, Midrasch für den Fest-Cyclus und die ausgezeichneten Sabbathe. Vienna 1880.

GREENUP A.W. The Yalkut of R. Machir bar Abba Mari on the Minor Prophets. Volume 1, London 1908.

HALEVY A.A. Midrash Rabbah. 8 Volumes, Tel-Aviv 1956-63.

HIGGER M. Maseket Soferim. New York 1937 (reprinted in Jerusalem 1970).

HOROWITZ S. "Der Sifre sutta nach dem Jalkut und anderen Quellen", MGWJ 51(1907)338-39.

HOROWITZ H.S. Siphre d'be Rab. Fasciculus primus: Siphre ad Numeros adjecto Siphre Zutta. Leipzig 1917.

---- Mechilta d'Rabbi Ishmael cum variis lectionibus et adnotationibus. (1931). Reprinted in Jerusalem 1960.

HYMAN A. Yalqut Shime'oni on Exodus. Jerusalem 1977.

JAPHET ben ALI HA-LEVI Libri Psalmorum David Regis et Prophetarum. Versio arabice concinnata. 1861.

KELLER B. "Fragment d'un traité d'exégèse massorétique", Textus 5 (1966) 60-83.

KRAFT R.A. The Testament of Job according to the SV Text. Montana 1974.

KOHUT A. Aruch Completum. 4 Volumes, New York 1955.

LAUTERBACH J. Mekilta of Rabbi Ishmael. A Critical Edition on the basis of the Manuscripts and early Editions with an English Translation. 3 Volumes, Philadelphia 1939.

MANDELBAUM B. Pesikta de Rav Kahana. New York 1962.

- MARGULIES M. Midrash Wayyikra Rabbah. A Critical Edition based on Manuscripts and Geniza Fragments with variants and notes. 5 Volumes, Jerusalem 1958-60.
- MEKHILTA Constantinople Edition 1515. Facsimile Reproduction. Jerusalem 1971.
- Venice Edition 1545. Within Volume 2 of the Miqra'oth Gedoloth, New York 1950.
- MIDRASH SHEMUEL Warsaw Edition 1873. Reproduced in Jerusalem 1960.
- MIQRA'OTH GEDOLOTH Pentateuch. 6 Volumes, New York 1950; Prophets and Writings. 3 Volumes, Tel-Aviv 1954.
- MIZRAHI ELIJAH Commentary on Rashi by Elijah Mizrahi. Warsaw 1862-63.
- NEMOY L. Ya'qub al-Qirqisani: Kitab al-Anwar wal-Maraqib. Code of Karaite Law. 5 Volumes, New York 1939.
- RABINOWITZ Z.M. Midrash Haggadol on the Pentateuch. Numbers. Jerusalem 1967.
- SCHECHTER S. Aboth de Rabbi Nathan. Vienna, Frankfurt, London 1887.
- SIPHRE ON NUMBERS Venice Edition 1545. Within Volume 4 of the Miqra'oth Gedoloth, New York 1950.
- SIPHRE ON NUMBERS AND DEUTERONOMY Codex Vaticanus 32. Facsimile Reproduction, Jerusalem 1972.
- TALMUD BAVLI Reprint of the Wilna Edition 1886. 20 Volumes, Jerusalem 1958-61.
- TALMUD YERUSHALMI Krotoschin Edition 1886, based on the first edition (Vienna 1522). Reprinted in Jerusalem 1969.
- Reprint of the Wilna Edition 1899-1903. Jerusalem 1960.
- TANHUMA First Edition, Constantinople 1520-22. Facsimile reproduction, Jerusalem 1971.
- Mantua Edition 1563. Facsimile reproduction, Jerusalem 1971.
- TAYLOR C. Sayings of the Fathers comprising Pirke Aboth in Hebrew and English, with Notes and Excursus. Cambridge 1897.
- THEODOR J. - ALBECK C. Bereschit Rabbah mit kritischen Apparat und Kommentar. 3 Volumes, Berlin 1912-36 (reprinted in Jerusalem 1965).
- VIDAL S. Sefer Torat Kohanim. Husiatin 1908 (reprinted in Israel 1968).
- WEISS I.H. Mechilta der Hlteste halachische und hagadische Commentar zum zum zweiten Buch Moses. Vienna 1865.
- YALQUT SHIME'ONI Salonica Editions (Part I: 1521; Part II: 1526-27).

Reprinted in Jerusalem 1968-73.

----- Warsaw 1876-77 (Goldman Edition).

ZUCKERMANDEL M.S. Tosephta. Jerusalem 1937 (2nd ed.).

B. Other Works

ALBRIGHT W.F. "Some Remarks on the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy XXXII",
VT 9 (1959) 339-46.

ANDERSON F.I. The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew. Le Hague - Paris 1974.

ARZI A. "Al Tikrei" in Encyclopaedia Judaica. Jerusalem 1974 (3rd ed.),
Vol. 2, p.776.

----- "Tikkun Soferim" in EJ, Vol. 15, pp.1139-40.

ASSEMANUS S. Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae Codicum Manuscriptorum
Catalogus. Romae 1756.

BACHER W. Die Agada der Tannaiten. 2 Volumes, Strasbourg 1890-1903.

----- Die Agada der palästinensischen Amoräer. 3 Volumes,
Strasbourg 1892-99.

----- Die Exegetische Terminologie der Jüdischen Traditionsliteratur.
2 Volumes, Leipzig 1899-1905.

BAENTSCH B. Exodus -Leviticus - Numeri. (HK), Göttingen 1903.

BAETHGEN F. Die Psalmen. (KH), Göttingen 1897 (2nd ed.).

BARDY G. Eusèbe, Histoire Ecclésiastique, I-IV. (SC), Paris 1952.

----- Oeuvres de St. Augustin, No. 37. La Cité de Dieu. Paris 1960.

BARNES W.E. "Ancient Corrections in the Text of the Old Testament", JThS
1 (1899-1900) 387-414.

BARTHELEMY J.D. "Les Tiquné Sopherim et la Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien
Testament", VTS 9 (1963) 285-304.

----- Les Devanciers d'Aquila. (VTS 10), Leiden 1963.

----- "Eusèbe, La Septante et 'Les Autres'", in La Bible et les Pères
(Colloque de Strasbourg 1969), Paris 1971, pp.51-56.

----- Etudes d'Histoire du Texte de l'Ancien Testament. (OBO),
Fribourg et Göttingen 1978.

BARTHELEMY et al. Preliminary and Interim Report on the Hebrew Old Testa-
ment Text Project. 5 Volumes, London, Stuttgart, New York
1973,77,79 ...

- BAUER H. - LEANDER P. Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments. Halle 1922 (reprinted in Hildesheim 1962).
- BENZINGER J. Die Bücher der Könige. (KHC), Freiburg im B. 1899.
- BERTHOLET A. Hesekiel. (KHC), Freiburg im B. 1897.
- BLANK S.H. "The Curse, Blasphemy, the Spell and the Oath", HUCA 23 (1950-1951) 73-95.
- BLOCH R. "Midrash" in DBSup 5 (1957) 1263-81.
- BLOMMERDE A. Northwest Semitic Grammar and Job. (BO, no.22), Rome 1969.
- BOLING R.G. Judges. (AB), New York 1975.
- van den BORN A. Ezechiel. Roermond en Maaseik 1954.
- BOWKER J. The Targums and Rabbinic Literature. An Introduction to Jewish Interpretations of Scripture. Cambridge 1969.
- BRAWER A.J. "Substitution of Anthropomorphisms in Ancient Translations of the Bible", BetM 57 (1974) 161-193 (in Hebrew with an English summary on pp.305-304).
- BREASTED J.H. Ancient Records of Egypt, Historical Documents from the Earliest Times to the Persian Conquest. 5 Volumes, New York 1905-6, reprinted in 1962.
- BRICHTO H.C. The Problem of "Curse" in the Hebrew Bible. JBL Monograph Series, Vol. XIII, Pennsylvania 1963.
- BRIGGS C. Psalms. (ICC), 2 Volumes, Edinburgh 1909 (2nd ed.).
- BRIGHT J. Jeremiah. (AB), New York 1965.
- BROWN F. - DRIVER S. - BRIGGS C. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford 1907 (reprinted 1978, 10th ed.).
- BUDDE K. The Books of Samuel in Hebrew. Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text. Leipzig 1894.
- Das Buch Hiob. (HK), Göttingen 1896.
- Das Buch der Richter. (KHC), Freiburg im B. 1897.
- Die Bücher Samuel. (KHC), Tübingen u. Leipzig 1902.
- "Zu Text und Auslegung des Buches Hosea", JBL 45 (1926) 280-97.
- BUDDE K. - BERTHOLET A. - WILDEBOER G. Die Fünf Megillot. Tübingen 1898.
- BURNEY C.F. The Book of Judges, with Introduction and Notes, and Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings. (First Published separately in 1918 and 1903 respectively). Reprinted in New York 1970.

- CAPEL L. Critica Sacra, sive de Variis quae in Sacris Veteris Testamenti Libris occurrunt. Lectionibus libri sex. Paris 1650.
- CAZELLES H. "Nom" in VThB, Paris 1970 (2nd ed.), coll.827-30.
- CHEYNE T.K. Job and Solomon, or the Wisdom of the Old Testament. London 1887.
- CHILDS B. Exodus. A Commentary. (OTL), London 1974.
- COOKE G. The Book of Ezekiel. (ICC), Edinburgh 1951 (2nd ed.).
- CORNILL C.H. Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel. Leipzig 1886.
- COWLEY A.E. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, as enlarged and edited by the late E. Kautzsch. (2nd English ed. 1910), Oxford 1976.
- CROSS F.M. The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies. New York 1958.
- "The History of Biblical Texts in the Light of Discoveries in the Judean Desert", HThR 57 (1964) 281-300.
- DAHOD M. Psalms. (AB), 3 Volumes, New York 1965-70.
- DELCOR M. "Le Temple d'Onias en Egypte", RB 75 (1968) 188-205.
- DELITZSCH F. Das Buch Hiob. (BC), Leipzig 1876.
- Neuer Commentar über die Genesis. Leipzig 1887.
- Die Psalmen. (BK), Leipzig 1894 (5th ed.).
- DHORME P. Les Livres de Samuel. (EB), Paris 1910.
- Le Livre de Job. (EB), Paris 1926.
- DILLMANN A. Die Bücher Genesis, Exodus und Leviticus. (KeH), Leipzig 1886 (3rd ed.).
- DOTAN A. "Masorah" in EJ, Vol. 16, pp.1401-1482.
- DRIVER S.R. Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel. Oxford 1890.
- DRIVER S.R. - GRAY G.B. Job. (ICC), Edinburgh 1921.
- DUHM B. Das Buch Hiob. (KHC), Freiburg im B. 1897.
- Die Psalmen. (KHC), Freiburg im B. 1899.
- Das Buch Jesaja. (HK), Göttingen 1902 (2nd ed.).
- EHRENFELD S. "Euphemism" in JE, Vol.5, pp.267-68.
- EHRlich A.B. Die Psalmen. Berlin 1905.
- Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel. 7 Volumes,, Leipzig 1908-14.

- EICHRODT W. Der Prophet Hesekiel. (ATD), Göttingen 1959.
- Theology of the Old Testament. 2 Volumes, London 1967.
- ELISSFELDT O. Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Tübingen 1964 (3., neu bearbeitete Auflage).
- ELLIGER K. Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten. (ATD), Göttingen 1950.
- EPSTEIN I. The Babylonian Talmud. 18 Volumes, (English Translation), London 1961.
- FELDMANN F. Das Buch Isaias. (EH), Vol.2, Münster 1926.
- FERNANDEZ MARCOS N. - SAENZ BADILLOS A. Theodoreti Cyrensis Quaestiones in Octateuchum. Editio Critica. Madrid 1979.
- FICHTNER J. Das Erste Buch von den Königen. Stuttgart 1964.
- FISCHER J. Das Buch Isaias. (HSAT), Vol.2, Bonn 1939.
- FITZMYER J. "Some Observations on the Targum of Job from Qumran Cave 11", CBQ 36 (1974) 503-24.
- FOHRER G. Hiob. (KAT), Gütersloh 1963.
- FOHRER G. - GALLING K. Ezechiel. (HAT), Tübingen 1955.
- FREEDMAN H. - SIMON M. Midrash Rabbah. 10 Volumes, (English Translation) London 1961.
- FRITSCH C.T. The Anti-anthropomorphisms of the Greek Pentateuch. Princeton 1943.
- GEIGER A. Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von den inneren Entwicklung des Judentums. Breslau 1857 (reed. Frankfurt am Main 1928).
- GESENIUS W. Thesaurus Philologicus Criticus Linguae Hebraeae et Chaldaee Veteris Testamenti. Leipzig 1827-35.
- GESENIUS W. - BUHL F. Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament. Leipzig 1899.
- GESENIUS W. - KAUTZSCH E. Hebräische Grammatik. Leipzig 1909 (28th ed.).
- GIESEBRECHT F. Jeremia. (HAT), Göttingen 1894.
- GINSBERG L. "Anthropomorphism" in JE, Vol.1, pp.621-25.
- GINSBURG C.D. The Massorah compiled from Manuscripts, Alphabetically and Lexically Arranged. 4 Volumes, London 1880-1905.
- Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible. London 1897.
- GINSBURGER M. "Die Anthropomorphismen in den Thargumim", JpTh 17 (1891) 262-280 and 430-458.

- GOLDIN J. The Fathers according to Rabbi Nathan. (English Translation), New Haven 1955.
- GORDON C.H. Ugaritic Literature, a Comprehensive Translation of the Poetic and Prose Texts. Rome 1949.
- GORDIS R. "'The Branch to the Nose', A Note on Ezekiel viii 17", JThS 37 (1936) 284-88.
- The Song of Songs and Lamentations. A Study, Modern Translation and Commentary. Revised and augmented edition, New York 1974 (3rd ed.).
- The Biblical Text in the Making, A Study of the Kethib-Qere. New York 1971.
- The Book of Job, Commentary, New Translation and Special Studies. New York 1978.
- GOTTSTEIN M.H. "Die Jesaja-Rolle im Lichte von Peschitta und Targum", Biblica 35 (1954) 51-71.
- GRAY G.B. Numbers. (ICC), Edinburgh 1903.
- GRAY J. I and II Kings. London 1970 (2nd ed.).
- GROSSFELD B. A Bibliography of Targumic Literature. Cincinnati-New York 1972 (Vol.1), 1977 (Vol.2).
- "Bible: Translations, Aramaic" in EJ, Vol.4, pp.841-51.
- GUNKEL H. Die Psalmen. Göttingen 1968 (5th ed.).
- Genesis. Göttingen 1901 (reed. 1966).
- HARPER W. Amos and Hosea. (ICC), Edinburgh 1910.
- HATCH E. - REDPATH H. A Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament. Graz 1954.
- HAYWARD R. "The Memra of YHWH and the Development of its Use in Targum Neofiti I", JJS 24 (1973) 414-418.
- HEINISCH P. Das Buch Ezechiel. (HSAT), Bonn 1923.
- Das Buch Genesis. (HSAT), Bonn 1930.
- Das Buch Numeri. (HSAT), Bonn 1936.
- HELLER B. "Euphemismus" in Encyclopaedia Judaica. Berlin 1930, Vol.6, pp.832-34.
- HEMPEL J. "Die israelitischen Anschauungen von Segen und Fluch im Lichte altorientalischer Parallelen", ZDMG 4 (1925) 20-110.
- "Zu 4Q Deut 32:8", ZAW 33 (1962) 70.
- HENGSTENBERG E.W. Commentary on the Psalms. Edinburgh 1863-64.

- HERKENNE H. Das Buch der Psalmen. (HSAT), Bonn 1936.
- HERR M.D. "Mekhilta of R. Ishmael" in EJ, Vol.11, pp.1267-68.
- "Sifrei" in EJ, Vol.14, pp.1519-21.
- "Tanḥuma Yelammedenu" in EJ, Vol.15, pp.794-96.
- HERTZBERG H.W. Die Bücher Josua, Richter, Ruth. (ATD), Göttingen 1953.
- HILLERS D. Lamentations. (AB), New York 1972.
- HIRSCH S.R. Die Psalmen. 2 Volumes, Frankfurt am Main 1882.
- HIRSCHFELD H. Qirqisani Studies. London 1918.
- HIRZEL L. Hiob. (KeH), Leipzig 1852 (2nd. ed.).
- HITZIG F. Die Psalmen. Leipzig u. Heidelberg 1863.
- Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten. (KeH), Leipzig 1863 (3rd ed.).
- HOFFMANN E. De Civitate Dei. (CSEL), 2 Volumes, Prague, Vienna, Leipzig 1900 (reprinted in New York and London 1962).
- HOELSCHER G. Das Buch Hiob. (HAT), Tübingen 1952.
- HOLZINGER H. Genesis. (KHC), Tübingen u. Leipzig 1898.
- van HOONACKER A. Les Douze Petits Prophètes traduits et commentés. (EB), Paris 1908.
- HORST F. Hiob. (BK), Neukirchen 1968.
- HOUBIGANTIUS C.F. Notae Criticae in universos Veteris Testamenti Libros. 2 Volumes, Frankfurt am Main 1777.
- HUMBERT P. Problèmes du Livre de Habakkuk. Neuchâtel 1944.
- HUPFELD H. Die Psalmen. 4 Volumes, Gotha 1855-62.
- "Ueber eine bisher unbekannt gebliebene Handschrift der Masorah", ZDMG 21 (1867) 201-220.
- HYMAN A. The Sources of the Yalquṭ Shimeoni on the Prophets and Hagiographa. Together with Parallels and Cross-Indices from the Source Books to the Yalquṭ. Jerusalem 1965.
- JACOB E. Osée. Neuchâtel 1965.
- JASTROW M. A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic Literature. 2 Volumes, London - New York 1886 (reprinted in 1950).
- JIRKU A. "Neues keilschriftliches Material zum Alten Testament", ZAW 39 (1921) 144-60.

- JOUON P. Grammaire de l'Hébreu Biblique. Rome 1923.
- JUNKER H. Das Buch Deuteronomium. (HSAT), Bonn 1933.
- Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten. (HSAT), Vol.2, Bonn 1938.
- KAHLE P. Masoreten des Westens II. Stuttgart 1930.
- The Cairo Geniza. The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1941. London 1947.
- KASOWSKI C.J. Thesaurus Talmudis, Concordantiae Verborum. 39 Volumes, Jerusalem 1954-78.
- KAUFMAN S.A. "The Job Targum from Qumran", JAOS 93 (1973) 317-27.
- KEIL C.F. Biblischer Commentar über die Prophetischen Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments. (BC), Leipzig 1863-64.
- KITTEL R. Die Psalmen. (KAT), Leipzig 1929 (6th ed.).
- Die Bücher der Könige. (HK), Göttingen 1900.
- KLEIN M.L. "The Preposition בְּ (Before): A Pseudo-anti-anthropomorphism in the Targums", JThS 30 (1979) 502-7.
- KNOBEL A. Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua. (KeH), Leipzig 1861.
- Der Prophet Jesaja. (KeH), Leipzig 1854 (2nd ed.).
- KOEHLER L. - BAUMGARTNER W. Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. Leiden 1953.
- KOENIG E. Die Genesis. Gütersloh 1925 (2nd ed.).
- Die Psalmen. Gütersloh 1927.
- Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik in Bezug auf die Biblische Literatur. Leipzig 1900.
- KOSOVSKY B. Otzar Leshon Hatanna'im. Concordantiae Verborum quae in Mechilta d'Rabbi Ismael reperiuntur. Jerusalem 1965.
- Otzar Leshon Hatanna'im. Concordantiae Verborum quae in Sifra aut Torat Kohanim reperiuntur. Jerusalem 1967-8.
- Otzar Leshon Hatanna'im. Concordantiae Verborum quae in Sifrei reperiuntur. 5 Volumes, Jerusalem 1970-74.
- KRAETZSCHMAR R. Das Buch Ezechiel. (HK), Göttingen 1900.
- KRAUS H.-J. Psalmen. (BK), 2 Volumes, Neukirchen 1978 (5th ed.).
- Klagelieder. (BK), Neukirchen 1960.

- KRUPNIK B. - SILBERMANN A.M. A Dictionary of the Talmud, the Midrash and the Targum, with quotations from the sources. London 1927.
- KUHN K.G. Tannaitische Midrashim. 3 Volumes, Stuttgart 1959.
- KUTSCHER E.Y. The Language and Linguistic background of the Isaiah Scroll, 1QIs^a. Leiden 1974: and a Supplement containing Indices and Corrections, by E. Qimron, Leiden 1979.
- LABAT et autres, Les Religions du Proche-Orient asiatique. Textes babyloniens, ougaritiques, hittites. Paris 1970.
- LE DEAUT R. Introduction à la Littérature Targumique, Première Partie. Rome 1966.
- Targum du Pentateuque. Traduction des deux Recensions Palestiniennes Complètes avec Introduction, Parallèles, Notes et Index. (SC), Paris 1978 ...
- "A propos d'une définition du Midrash", Biblica 50 (1969) 395-413.
- "Un phénomène spontané de l'herméneutique juive ancienne: 'le targumisme'", Biblica 52 (1971) 505-525.
- "The Current State of Targumic Studies", BThB 4 (1974) 1-32.
- LEIMBACH K. Samuel. (HSAT), Bonn 1936.
- LEVIAS C. "Masorah" in JE, Vol.8, p.366.
- LEVY J. Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim. 4 Volumes, Berlin u. Wien 1924 (reprinted in Darmstadt 1963).
- LIEBERMAN S. Hellenism in Jewish Palestine. Studies in the Literary Transmission, Beliefs and Manners of Palestine in the I Century B.C.E. - IV C.E. New York 1950 (reprinted in 1962).
- Siphre Zutta (The Midrash of Lydda). II The Talmud of Caesarea. New York 1968.
- LIPINSKI E. "Nimrod et Assur", RB 73 (1966) 77-93.
- LIPPL J. - THEIS J. Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten. (HSAT), Vol.1, Bonn 1937.
- LOEHR M. Die Klagelieder des Jeremia. (HK), Göttingen 1893.
- Die Bücher Samuelis von Otto Thenius. (3rd ed.). Leipzig 1898.
- LUZZATTO S.D. Il Profeta Isaia. Volgareizzato e commentato. Padua 1855.
- Commentary on the Pentateuch. Padua 1871, newly edited by P. Schlesinger, Tel-Aviv 1965.
- McCARTHY C. "Emendations of the Scribes" in IDBSup (1976) 263-64.

- McKANE W. "Observations on the Tikkune Soperim" in On Language, Culture and Religion in Honour of Eugene Nida, edited by M. Black and W. Smalley, Hague 1974, pp.53-77.
- McKENZIE J. Second Isaiah. (AB), New York 1968.
- McNAMARA M. The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch. Second Printing with Supplement containing Additions and Corrections. (AnBibl 27A), Rome 1978.
- "Targums", IDBSup (1976) 856-61.
- "Some Early Rabbinic Citations and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch", RSO 41 (1966) 1-15.
- MALAMAT A. "Aspects of the Foreign Policies of David and Solomon", JNES 22(1963) 1-17.
- MANDELKERN S. Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae. 2 Volumes, Schocken 1937 (reprinted in Tel-Aviv 1971).
- MARGOLIOUTH M.A. Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts in the British Museum. 3 Volumes, London 1899 (reprinted in 1965).
- MARTI K. Das Buch Jesaja. (KHC), Tübingen 1900.
- Dodekapropheton. (KHC), Tübingen 1904.
- MARTIN R. Pugio Fidei adversus Mauros et Judaeos, cum observationibus Joseph de Voisin et introductione Jo. Benedicti Carpzovi. Leipzig 1687 (2nd ed.).
- MAYBAUM S. Die Anthropomorphien und Anthropopathien bei Onkelos und den spätern Targumim. Breslau 1870.
- MAYS J.L. Hosea. (OTL), London 1975 (2nd ed.).
- METZGER M. Le Livre des Parterres Fleuris d'Aboul-Walid Merwan Ibn Djanah traduit en Français sur les manuscrits arabes. Paris 1889.
- MICHAELIS J.D. Orientalische und Exegetische Bibliothek. 24 Volumes, Frankfurt am Main 1771-89.
- MIGNE J.P. Patrologiae cursus completus, Series Graeca. Paris 1857-1866.
- Patrologiae cursus completus, Series Latina. Paris 1842-1892.
- MITCHELL H. The Minor Prophets. (ICC), 2 Volumes, Edinburgh.
- MOLLAT D. "Gloire" in VthB (1970) 504-510.
- de MONTFAUCON B. Johannis Chrysostomi opera omnia quae exstant. Editio Parisina Altera, Emendata et Aucta. 13 Volumes, Paris 1836-39.
- MONTGOMERY J.A. and GEHMAN H.S. The Books of Kings. (ICC), Edinburgh 1951.
- MOORE G.F. Judges. (ICC), Edinburgh 1918 (2nd ed.).

- MORESCHINI C. Tertulliani Adversus Marcionem. Milano 1971.
- MOWINCKEL S. Psalmenstudien. Amsterdam 1961.
- MUNOZ LEON D. "Soluciones de los Targumim del Pentateuco a los antropomorfismos", EstB 28 (1969) 263-81.
- NEMOY L. "Al Qirgisani's account of Jewish Sects and Christianity", HUCA 7 (1930) 317-397.
- "A tenth century disquisition on Suicide according to Old Testament Law", JBL 57 (1938) 411-20.
- "Kirkisani, Jacob Al-." in EJ, Vol. 10, pp.1047-48.
- NEUBAUER A. Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library. Oxford 1886.
- NICKELS P. Targum and New Testament, A Bibliography together with a New Testament Index. Rome 1967.
- NIELSEN B.E. "Tiqqune Sopherim" (unpublished work submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Divinity in Union Theological Seminary, 1977).
- NOELDEKE T. Neue Beiträge zur Semitischen Sprachwissenschaft. Strassburg 1910.
- NOETSCHER F. Das Buch Jeremias. (HSAT), Bonn 1934.
- NORTH C.R. The Second Isaiah. Introduction, Translation and Commentary to Chapters XL - LV. London 1964.
- NOTH M. Könige. (BK), Neukirchen 1968 ...
- Das vierte Buch Mose. (ATD), Göttingen 1966.
- NOWACK W. Die Bücher Samuelis. (HK), Göttingen 1902.
- Kleine Propheten. (HK), Göttingen 1903.
- OLSHAUSEN J. Die Psalmen. Leipzig 1853.
- OTTO J. Sancti Justini Philosophi et Martyris Opera. 2 Volumes, Jena 1842-3.
- PAFFRATH T. Die Klagelieder. (HSAT), Bonn 1932.
- PAUL A. "Littérature Intertestamentaire I: les Etudes Targumiques", RechSR 60 (1972) 430-444.
- PAUL S.M. - RABINOWITZ L.I. "Euphemism and Dysphemism" in EJ, Vol.6, pp.959-962.
- de PAULY J. Zohar. 6 Volumes, Paris 1906-11 (French Translation).
- PETERS N. Hiob. Münster 1928.

- PETITJEAN A. Les Oracles du Proto-Zacharie. (EB), Paris-Louvain 1969.
- POPE M. Job. (AB), New York 1965.
- PRITCHARD J. Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament. Princeton 1950.
- The Ancient Near East in Pictures relating to the Old Testament. Princeton 1954.
- von RAD G. Das erste Buch Mose. (ATD), Göttingen 1952.
- Das fünfte Buch Mose. (ATD), Göttingen 1964.
- RIGNELL L.G. A Study on the Book of Isaiah. Ch. 40-55. Lund 1956.
- ROBERTS B.J. The Old Testament Text and Versions. The Hebrew Text in Transmission and the History of the Ancient Versions. Cardiff 1951.
- ROBINSON T.H. - HORST F. Die Zwölf kleinen Propheten. (HAT), Tübingen 1954.
- ROSENMUELLER E.F.C. Psalmi. 3 Volumes, Leipzig 1821-23.
- de ROSSI J.B. Manuscripti Codices Hebraici Bibliothecae I.B. de Rossi. Parma 1803.
- ROTH C. (ed.) Encyclopaedia Judaica. 16 Volumes, Jerusalem 1974 (3rd ed.).
- RUDOLPH W. "Der Text der Klagelieder", ZAW 56 (1938) 101-122.
- Jeremia. (HAT), Tübingen 1947.
- Das Buch Ruth, Das Hohe Lied, Die Klagelieder. (KAT), Gütersloh 1962.
- Hosea. (KAT), Gütersloh 1968.
- Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephania. (KAT), Gütersloh 1975.
- Haggai, Sacharja, Maleachi. (KAT), Gütersloh 1976.
- SABOURIN L. "The Memra of God in the Targums", BThB 6 (1976) 79-85.
- SAGGS H.W.F. "The Branch to the Nose, Ez 8:17", JThS 11 (1960) 318-329.
- SALOMONSEN B. Die Tosefta, Seder IV: Nezikin. Stuttgart 1976.
- SANDA A. Die Bücher der Könige. (EH), Münster 1911.
- SARNA N. "Ezekiel 8:17: a fresh examination", HThR 57 (1964) 347-352.
- SCHAB M. Le Talmud de Jérusalem. 11 Volumes, Paris 1871-89 (French Translation).

- SCHMIDT H. Die Psalmen. (HAT), Tübingen 1934.
- SCHULZ A. Die Bücher Samuel. (EH), Münster 1927.
- Das Buch Richter und das Buch Ruth. (HSAT), Bonn 1926.
- SCHULZE J.L. Theodoretus Episcopus Cyri. Omnia Opera ex recensione Iacobi Sirmondi. 5 Volumes, Halle 1769-1774.
- SKEHAN P.W. "A Fragment of the 'Song of Moses' (Deut.32) from Qumran". BASOR 136 (1954) 12-15.
- "Qumran and the present state of Old Testament Studies", JBL 78 (1959) 21-25.
- SKINNER J. Genesis. (ICC), Edinburgh 1912.
- SMITH H.P. Samuel. (ICC), Edinburgh 1912.
- SPEISER E. Genesis. (AB), New York 1964.
- SPIEGEL S. "Ezekiel or Pseudo-Ezekiel?", HThR 24 (1931) 246-321.
- STEINSCHNEIDER M. Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin. 2 Volumes, Berlin 1897.
- STEUERNAGEL C. Deuteronomium und Josua. (HAT), Göttingen 1900.
- STOEBE H.J. Das erste Buch Samuelis. (KAT), Gütersloh 1973.
- STRACK H. Einleitung in Talmud und Midrash. Munich 1976 (6th ed., first published in 1887).
- Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash. (English Translation of the 5th German Edition (1920) of Einleitung...) New York 1974.
- STRACK H. - BILLERBECK P. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash. 4 Volumes, Munich 1922-28.
- SZCZYGIEL P. Hiob. (HSAT), Bonn 1931.
- TERRIEN S. Job. Neuchâtel 1963.
- THEODOR J. "Midrash Haggadah" in JE, Vol.8, pp.560-61.
- THENIUS O. Die Bücher Samuels. (KeH), Leipzig 1842 (1st ed.), 1864 (2nd ed.) 1898 (3rd ed.).
- TSEVAT M. "Ishboshet and Congeners", HUCA 46 (1975) 71-87.
- VAJDA G. "Etudes sur Qirgisani" I : REJ 106 (1941-45) 87-123; II : REJ 107 (1946-47) 52-98; III : REJ 108 (1948) 63-91; IV : REJ 120 (1961) 211-57; V : REJ 122 (1963) 1-74.
- VALLARSIUS D. Hieronymi operum. 12 Volumes, Venice 1768 (2nd ed.).

- VEIJOLA T. "David und Meribaal", RB 85 (1978) 338-61.
- VUILLEUMIER R. - KELLER C. Michée, Nahoum, Habacuc, Sophonie. Neuchâtel 1971.
- WARD W. Habakkuk. (ICC), Edinburgh 1912.
- WEDDEL A. De Emendationibus a Sopherim in Libris Sacris Veteris Testamenti Propositis. Breslau 1869.
- WEISER A. Die Kleinen Propheten. Vol.1, (ATD), Göttingen 1949.
- Das Buch Hiob. (ATD), Göttingen 1951.
- Jeremia. (ATD), Göttingen 1952.
- Klagelieder. (ATD), Göttingen 1958.
- WELLHAUSEN J. Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments. Berlin 1899 (3rd ed.).
- WESTERMANN C. Genesis I,15. (BK), Neukirchen 1979.
- WEVERS J.W. "Exegetical Principles underlying the Septuagint Text of I Kings ii 12 - xxi 43", OTS 8 (1950) 300-322.
- WIESMANN H. Die Klagelieder. Frankfurt am Main 1954.
- WILDBERGER H. Jesaja. (BK), Neukirchen 1972.
- WINTER J. - WUENSCH A. Mechilta. Ein tannaitischer Midrasch zu Exodus. Leipzig 1909 (German Translation).
- WOLFF H. Hosea. (BK), Neukirchen 1961.
- WUENSCH A. Midrasch Tehillim. 2 Volumes, Trier 1892-93 (reprinted in Hildesheim 1967, German Translation).
- WUERTHWEIN E. Der Text des Alten Testaments. Stuttgart 1973 (4th ed.).
- WUERTHWEIN E. - GALLING K. - PLOGER O. Die fünf Megilloth. (HAT), Tübingen 1969.
- YARON R. "The Coptos Decree and 2 Sam XII 14", VT 9 (1959) 89-91.
- ben YEHUDA E. A Complete Dictionary of Ancient and Modern Hebrew. 16 Volumes, New York and London 1908-1959.
- YORK A. "The dating of Targumic Literature", JSJ 5 (1974) 49-62.
- ZIMMERLI W. Ezechiel. (BK), Neukirchen 1969.
- ZUNZ L. Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden. Frankfurt am Main 1892 (reprinted in Hildesheim 1966).

C. Manuscripts

BERLIN : STAATSBIBLIOTHEK: MS Or. fol. 1213 (formerly Erfurt III),
Bibel mit Masora.

LONDON : BRITISH LIBRARY:

BM 64 Or. 4445 Pentateuch (c.820-850).

BM 55 Add. 15,451 Hebrew Bible with Masorah (13th. c.).

BM 116 Add. 21,161 Prophets and Hagiographa (mid 12th. c.,
formerly Ebner II of Nürnberg).

BM 341 Add. 16,406 Bereshith Rabbah, Siphra, Siphre (12th.c.).

BM 342 (Harley 5704) Yalqut ha-Makhiri (1514).

MADRID : UNIVERSITY LIBRARY:

MS Heb. 1. Hebrew Bible, dated Toledo 1280.

MUNICH : STAATSBIBLIOTHEK:

Codd. Hebr. 117 Mekhilta and Wayyiqra Rabbah and smaller
Midrashim. 1435.

OXFORD : BODLEIAN LIBRARY:

MS Neubauer 151 Pesiqta de R. Kahana, Mekhilta, Bor. of
Meleket ha-Mishkam, Siphra and Siphre.

MS Neubauer 153 Tanḥuma.

MS Neubauer 156 Tanḥuma.

MS Neubauer 167 Yalqut ha-Makhiri on the Psalms.

MS Neubauer 2491 Tanḥuma (fragmentary).

MS Neubauer 2637 Yalqut Shime'oni on the Pentateuch.

PARIS : NATIONAL LIBRARY:

MS Heb. 1-3 Hebrew Bible with Masorah, dated 1286.

PARMA : PALATINE LIBRARY:

MS 3254 (de Rossi 261) Tanḥuma b. Abba.

MS 2668 (de Rossi 782) Hebrew Bible, with Masorah, dated
Toledo 1277.

MS 2401 (de Rossi 1172) Yalqut Shime'oni (Part II), 15th c.

ROME : VATICAN LIBRARY:

MS Ebr. 44 Tanḥuma.

MS Ebr. 60 Midrash Bereshith Rabbah.

MS Ebr. 448 The Pentateuch with Masorah and Targum of
Onqelos, dated 1252.

INDEX OF AUTHORS

- Albeck C., 37
 Albright W.F., 212, 213
 Arzi A., 22, 139
 Assemanus S., 51
 Bacher W., 18, 25, 37, 38, 71,
 87, 91, 93, 139, 144, 152,
 163, 169, 227, 228
 Baentsch B., 125
 Baer S., 44, 45, 59
 Baethgen F., 104, 201, 203, 204
 Baillet M., 73
 Ball C., 74
 Barnes W.E., 22, 43, 44, 59,
 107, 127
 Bardtke H., 202
 Bardy G., 157
 Barthélemy D., 23, 65, 66, 67,
 133-135, 205, 211, 212, 213,
 214, 221
 Baumgartner W., 121
 Benoit P., 156
 Benzinger I., 234, 238
 Bertholet A., 94
 Biesenthal J., 83
 Billerbeck P., 174
 Blank S.H., 173, 192, 193
 Blommerde A., 116
 Boling R.G., 229
 van den Born A. 94
 Bowker J., 171
 Brawer A.J., 172
 Breasted J.H., 185
 Brichto H.C., 173, 192
 Briggs C., 104, 121, 201, 203
 Bright J., 104
 Brooke A., 205, 216, 217, 229,
 233
 Brown F., 121
 Buber M., 189, 202, 209, 233,
 234, 240
 Buber S., 33, 37, 38, 87, 88
 Budde K., 79, 81, 83, 101, 116,
 118, 122, 184, 190, 192, 200,
 205, 207, 209, 219, 222, 229,
 230, 235, 236
 Buhl F., 121
 Burney C.F., 234
 Burrows M., 109
 Capellus L., 83, 235
 Caquot A., 224
 Cazelles H., 183
 Cheyne T.K., 213
 Cooke G., 94
 Cornill C.H., 94, 104
 Cross F.M., 213
 Dahood M., 104
 Delcor M., 239, 240
 Delitzsch F., 74, 81, 116, 202, 211
 Dhorme E., 115, 230
 Dhorme P., 79, 81, 83, 116, 117, 118,
 119, 184, 190, 192, 205, 207, 210,
 211, 219, 222, 235
 Diaz Esteban F. 43
 Diez Macho A., 199
 Dillmann A., 74
 Driver S.R., 79, 81, 83, 116, 121, 190,
 192, 206, 209, 219, 222, 235
 Duhm B., 81, 104, 116, 192, 201, 202,
 203, 208, 209
 Ehrenfeld S., 167, 171, 178, 192
 Ehrlich A., 80, 107, 116, 125, 185,
 191, 192, 202, 206, 208, 209, 219,
 221, 236
 Eichrodt W., 94, 108
 Eissfeldt O., 213
 Elliger K., 17, 64, 99, 106, 113
 Epstein I., 147, 149
 Epstein J.N., 25, 145
 Feldmann F., 207
 Fernandez Marcos N., 229
 Fichtner J., 232, 234
 Field F., 190, 205, 217
 Finkelstein L., 132
 Fisch S., 31
 Fischer J., 208
 Fohrer G., 81, 94, 116, 119, 192, 209
 Frankfort H., 95
 Freedman H., 149
 Frensdorff S., 43
 Friedländer J., 48
 Friedmann M., 25, 26, 53, 93
 Fritsch C.T., 125
 Galling K., 94
 Gehman H.S., 232
 Geiger A., 20, 21, 62, 76, 78, 90, 94,
 98, 101, 106, 115, 116, 121, 123,
 125, 127, 185, 192, 198, 200, 203,
 204, 213, 226, 229, 240
 Gesenius W., 119, 121
 Giesebrecht F., 104
 Ginsburg C.D., 20, 21, 34, 42, 47, 48,
 49, 50, 51, 62, 81, 84, 85, 98, 101,

- 105, 106, 110, 113, 114, 115,
121, 123, 124, 125, 140, 184,
192, 200, 214, 223, 225, 226,
229, 231, 240
- Ginsburger M., 172
- Goldin J., 227
- Goldman I., 87
- Gordis R., 81, 95, 116, 168,
192, 209, 210
- Gordon C.H., 212
- Goshen-Gottstein M.H., 51, 208
- Gray G.B., 81, 116, 118, 119,
125, 128, 192, 209
- Gray J., 232, 234, 237
- Greenup A.W., 36, 38, 62
- Grossfeld B., 171
- Gunkel H., 73, 74, 110, 201,
202
- Halevy A.A., 37, 38, 133
- Harper W., 101
- Haywood R., 206
- Heinisch P., 74, 94, 125
- Heller B., 171
- Hempel J., 173, 188, 192
- Herkenne H., 104
- Herr M.D., 25, 30, 33
- Hertzberg W.H., 79, 83, 190,
229
- Higger M., 203
- Hillars D., 122
- Hirschfeld H., 180
- Hirtzel L., 209
- Hitzig F., 100, 106, 115
- Hoffmann E., 66
- Holmes R., 80
- Hölscher G., 81, 116, 192, 210
211
- Holzinger H., 74, 125
- van Hoonacker A., 64, 101, 107
- Horowitz H.S., 25, 26, 31, 80, 128
- Horowitz S., 31
- Horst F., 64, 81, 106, 192
- Houbigantius C.F., 71, 83
- Humbert P., 110
- Hupfeld H., 43
- Jacob E., 100
- Jirku A. 96
- Junker H., 64, 107, 115, 213
- Kahle P., 17, 22
- Kautzsch E., 74, 108, 119
- Keil C.F., 83, 188
- Keller B., 45, 46
- Keller C., 106
- Kennicott B., 62, 73, 80, 82, 84,
86, 102, 105, 112, 114, 124, 203,
207, 219, 229, 231, 234, 239
- Kittel R., 17, 201, 202, 203, 232, 234,
237
- Klein M., 172
- Knobel A., 125
- Köhler L., 121
- König E., 74, 171, 178, 184, 192, 203,
204
- Kohn J., 121 Kohut A., 62
- Kraetzschmar R., 94
- Kraft R.A., 194
- Kraus H.-J., 104, 122, 201, 202, 203
- Kuhn K.G., 28, 29
- Kutscher E.Y., 208, 239, 240
- Labat R., 224
- Lagarde P., 51
- Lauterbach J., 25, 145, 153, 154
- Lebrecht F., 83
- Le Déaut R., 172, 228
- Leimbach K., 79, 83, 184, 190
- Lévêque J., 81, 192, 210, 211
- Levias C., 23, 226
- Levy J., 91, 94, 169, 175, 178
- Lieberman S., 21, 22, 72, 94, 126
- Lippl J., 101
- Löhr M., 122
- Löwinger D.S., 52
- Luzzatto S.D., 198, 199, 200, 203
- McCarthy C., 23
- McKane W., 23, 26, 31, 33, 34, 63, 94
- McKenzie J.L., 207
- McLean N., 205, 216, 217, 229, 233
- McNamara M., 171, 172
- Malamat A., 224
- Mandelkern S., 121
- Margoliouth M.A., 42, 48
- Margulies M., 37
- Marti K., 101, 107, 108, 115, 208
- Maybaum S., 172
- Maynard J.A., 184, 190, 200, 207, 219,
222, 230
- Mays J., 100
- Melamed E.Z., 25, 145, 154
- Metzger M., 180
- Michaelis J.D., 106
- Migne J., 157
- Milik J.T., 73, 156
- Mitchell H., 64, 114, 115
- Mollat D., 99
- de Montfaucon B., 205
- Montgomery J.A., 192, 232, 234, 237
- Moore G.F., 229
- Moreschini C., 65
- Muñoz León D., 172, 206
- Nemoy L., 39, 40, 41, 137
- Nickels P., 171
- Nielsen B.E., 23, 34, 42

- Nöldeke T., 178, 192
 Nötscher F., 104
 North C.R., 207
 Norzi S., 51, 62, 203
 Noth M., 91, 125, 232, 238
 Nowack W., 64, 79, 83, 100, 107,
 115, 184, 190, 207, 219, 222,
 230, 235, 236
 Olshausen J., 104
 Osty E., 115, 202, 205, 207, 209,
 233, 234, 236, 237
 Otto J., 65
 Paffrath T., 122
 Parsons J., 80
 Paul S.M., 171, 178
 de Pauly J., 89
 Peters N., 81, 116, 117, 192,
 209,
 Petitjean A., 64, 65
 Pope M., 81, 116, 192, 210, 211
 Pritchard J., 96, 212
 Proeksch O., 113
 Rabinowitz L.I., 154, 171, 175,
 178, 192
 Rabinowitz Z.M., 31
 von Rad G., 73, 74, 213
 Rahlfs A., 102
 Rignell L.G., 208
 Robert J., 228
 Roberts B., 22
 Robinson T.H., 64, 106, 115, 121,
 de Rossi J., 73, 83, 84, 88, 102,
 112, 119, 234
 Rudolph W., 17, 64, 99, 100, 104,
 106, 115, 121, 122, 125, 128
 Sabatier P., 65, 205, 207
 Sabourin L., 206
 Saenz-Badillos A., 229
 Saggs H.W.F., 94, 95
 Sanda A., 232, 234, 237
 Sarna N.M., 95
 Schechter S., 128, 227
 Schenker A., 39
 Schmidt H., 104
 Schulz A., 79, 83, 184, 190, 207,
 221, 222, 230, 236
 Schulze J.L., 205
 Simon M., 147
 Skehan P.W., 221, 212, 213
 Skinner J., 73, 74
 Smith H.P., 79, 83, 184, 188, 190,
 200, 205, 207, 220, 221, 222, 230,
 235
 Socin A., 74
 Speiser E., 74
 Sperber A., 172
 Spiegel S., 94, 95
 Steinschneider M., 51
 Steuernagel C., 213
 Stier J., 210
 Stoebe H.-J., 79, 182, 185, 191, 207
 Strack H., 25, 30, 31, 33, 36, 37, 38,
 44, 45, 47, 59, 160, 174, 227
 Sular B., 52
 Szczygiel P., 81, 116, 192, 209
 Sznycer M., 224
 Targarona J., 229
 Ta-Shema I.M., 53
 Terrien S., 81, 116
 Thenius O., 78, 83, 219, 220, 221, 222
 Theodor J., 37
 Tsevat M., 216
 Ulrich E.C., 186, 206, 217, 218, 219,
 220, 230
 Vallarsius D., 66, 80
 Vajda G., 39
 de Vaux R., 73, 156
 Veijola T., 216
 Ward W., 106, 107
 Weber R., 66
 Wedell A., 21
 Weiser A., 81, 100, 104, 116, 192
 Weiss I.H., 25, 26
 Wellhausen J., 73, 74, 79, 83, 184,
 207, 219, 220, 222, 235
 Westermann C., 73, 74
 Wevers J., 212
 Wiesemann H., 122, 123
 Wildberger H., 201, 240
 Winton Thomas D., 209
 Wolff H., 101
 Würrthwein E., 17, 21, 22, 113
 Yaron R., 168, 185
 Yeivin I., 67
 Ziegler J., 65, 92, 113, 239
 Zimmerli W., 94
 Zuckerman M.S., 227
 Zunz L., 53

INDEX OF BIBLICAL QUOTATIONS

Genesis

1:1 132, 146, 150, 161
 1:3 143
 1:26 41, 132, 134, 137
 1:27 132, 134
 1:31 147
 2:1 145, 152, 231
 2:2 132, 134, 137
 2:4 146, 155, 161
 3:7 147
 4:1 194
 4:17 194
 4:25 194
 4:26 150
 5:2 132, 134
 5:24 194
 6:2 212
 6:4 194, 212
 7:2 172
 9:22 194
 9:23 141
 11:7 132, 134
 12:7 204
 14:1 176
 15:13 131, 136
 16:2 194
 16:5 49, 50, 55
 16:12 146
 17:1 204
 18:1 71, 72, 75, 204
 18:1-8 70
 18:8 74
 18:9-15 70
 18:11 194
 18:12 132, 134
 18:15 73
 18:16 70
 18:16-22 74
 18:17-19 73
 18:17-21 70
 18:19 74
 18:22 17, 21, 35, 37, 38, 40,
 43, 46, 49, 50, 51, 52,
 53, 55, 58, 70-76, 85,
 87, 91, 97, 139, 144,
 162, 163
 18:22-23 70
 18:22-33 73
 18:23 74
 18:27 74
 18:33 73, 74
 19:1 74

19:5 194
 19:27 76
 19:31 194
 20:4 194
 20:16 145, 155, 161
 21:33 155, 162, 231
 22:13 243
 22:14 204
 24:16 194
 25:23 143, 157
 26:2 204
 26:24 204
 27:23 119
 27:27 141
 29:23 194
 29:32 83
 30:3 194
 31:35 194
 33:10 198
 37:27 127, 128
 38:2 194
 38:8 194
 38:26 194
 39:1 155, 231
 39:9 204
 41:52 84
 45:13 99
 46:20 213
 46:21 213
 46:22 213
 46:27 213
 47:30 194
 49:6 132, 134
 49:12 159
 49:21 143
 49:22 156

Exodus

1:5 213
 1:10 174
 3:16 204
 4:1 204
 4:5 204
 4:20 132, 133, 135
 12:13 139, 140, 142, 155, 161
 12:17 139, 141, 151, 161
 12:40 41, 131, 132, 135, 136
 12:41 29
 14:22 139, 140, 145, 155, 161
 14:29 139, 140, 141, 155
 14:30 236

15:7	25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 77, 79, 86	24:11-16	183
16:7	182	24:15	78, 178
16:10	182	24:18	150, 231
16:15	139, 141, 154	25:21	150, 160, 161
17:6	76	26:3	72
17:8	139, 141	26:16	142, 150, 161
18:2-3	227	26:23	150
18:27	139, 153	<u>Numbers</u>	
19:17	139, 140, 147, 161	1:1	44, 50
20:26	194	10:35	25, 27, 28, 29, 245
22:8	141	11:2	143, 148, 155
22:27	78	11:15	17, 21, 26, 27, 30, 31, 32, 35, 40, 46, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 77, 86, 123- 128, 162, 170
23:15	198-202, 204, 241, 242	11:32	139, 140, 141, 149, 161, 162, 163
23:17	198-202	12:1	126
23:25	151, 158, 161, 321	12:9-10	126
24:1	182	12:11	126
24:5	132, 135	12:12	17, 21, 22, 27, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55, 123-128, 139, 148, 162, 184
24:10	28, 182	13:23	94
24:11	132, 135, 182	13:31	146, 163, 165
29:43	145, 159	14:21-22	182
32:1	146, 155, 160, 161	16:14	40, 174, 179-181, 183, 187, 188, 195
32:16	151	16:15	132, 133, 135
33:9	71	16:19	182
33:20	198	16:29	207
34:5	76	16:30	207
34:20	198-202, 241	17:7	182
34:23	198-202	18:17	141
34:24	198-202	20:6	182
40:34-35	182	20:29	231
<u>Leviticus</u>		21:14	161
1:5	150, 161	21:15	153
3:7	141	24:17	156, 161
4:32,35	141	<u>Deuteronomy</u>	
7:23	141	1:27	91
9:4	204	4:10	70
9:6	182	4:19	132, 134
9:23	182	6:7	153, 160, 165
11:6	132, 135	8:9	144, 153, 159
11:43	161	10:18	141
12:6	141	11:21	139, 144, 161, 163
14:21	141	11:36	203
14:24,25	141	16:16	198-202
18:14	194	17:3	132, 134
18:21		22:17	141
18:22	148, 149	23:14	141, 151, 161
19:26	155	23:18	148, 149
19:32	71	28:58	183
20:2	178		
20:3	112		
20:13	139, 140, 148, 161		
21:2	112		
21:6	112		
22:27	141		
23:12	141		
23:32	112		
23:40	157, 158, 161		

29:8 146, 153
 29:14 70
 30:3 28
 31:11 198-202
 31:14 139
 31:15 204
 31:19 145, 153
 32:8 211-214, 241
 32:9 211
 32:10 63
 32:15 139
 32:17 139, 144
 32:20 139, 141, 158
 32:21 139
 32:24 139
 32:25 139, 145
 32:42 243
 33:2 147, 161
 33:4 139, 145
 34:2 139, 145
 34:7 139

Joshua

2:1 141, 154
 22:22 203
 23:14 194

Judges

3:24 194
 3:31 236
 5:23 23:8
 6:32 214, 215
 7:1 215
 8:25 141
 8:29 215
 8:35 215
 9:1 215
 9:2 215
 9:5 215
 9:16 215
 9:24 215
 9:28,37 215
 13:21 198
 17:7 229
 18:30 124, 225-229
 19:25 194
 20:28 229

Ruth

1:17

1 Samuel

1:10 148
 1:11 83
 1:19 194
 1:22 198-202
 2:2 147, 165
 2:5 143, 155, 159

2:12-16 206
 2:17 206-207, 241
 2:22 235
 2:27 28
 3:13 17, 21, 26, 27, 30, 31, 32, 35, 37, 46, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55, 68, 76-79, 86, 129, 137, 144, 162, 164, 197, 233, 241, 247
 3:17 188
 3:21 198
 4:10 91
 8:7 87, 89, 162, 164
 11:2 190
 12:11 215
 14:23 236
 14:44 188
 14:47 235-237
 14:47-48 235
 14:49 216
 18:25 184
 20:13 188
 20:15 184
 20:16 170, 184, 187-191, 195, 200, 201, 230
 22:8 190
 23:5 236
 24:3 194
 24:7 83
 25:22 170, 184, 185, 187-191, 195, 230
 26:11 83
 26:24 83
 27:11 188
 29:4 170, 174, 179, 180, 181-182, 195
 29:8 184
 30:26 184

2 Samuel

2:8 216, 217, 219
 2:10 216, 219
 2:12 216, 217, 219
 2:15 216, 217, 218, 219
 3:7 216, 218, 219, 220
 3:8 216, 217, 218
 3:9 188
 3:11 219
 3:14 216, 217, 218, 219
 3:15 216, 217, 218
 3:35 188
 4:1,2 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 241
 4:4 216, 217, 221, 222
 4:5 216, 217, 218
 4:7 219
 4:8 216, 217, 218, 219

4:12	216, 217, 218, 241	8:23	110
5:6	231	9:1-5	237
5:8	230-231, 236	9:2	204
5:14-16	223	9:6	237
5:16	224	9:7	237
7:12	194	9:8	237-238, 241, 242
7:23	243	10:8	232-233, 238, 241, 242
8:6	236	11:4	232
8:9-11	223	11:7	243
8:10	223, 224, 225	11:29-30	141
8:14	236	12:16	17, 21, 32, 34, 35, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55, 85-91, 97, 142, 162, 163, 164, 165
9:6	216, 217, 221, 222	14:9	143, 150, 155
9:10	221, 222	18:2	198
9:11	221, 222	18:37	148
9:12	221, 222	19:2	188, 234
9:13	221, 222	19:3	234, 242
11:2	205	20:10	188
11:11	215	21:10	185, 191-195
12:3	155	21:13	168, 170, 185, 191-195
12:9	192, 204-206	<u>2 Kings</u>	
12:10	205	6:31	188
12:14	168, 170, 184-187, 188, 188, 189, 192, 195, 205, 206, 236	14:12	91
12:30	243	21:2-6	96
15:35	80	23:34	223
16:1	221, 222	23:35-36	223
16:4	221, 222	<u>1 Chronicles</u>	
16:12	17, 21, 35, 36, 37, 47, 48, 49, 53, 55, 81-85, 97, 121, 162, 196, 231	2:18	159
17:17	198	3:5-8	223
18:17	91	3:8	224
18:30	190	4:23	154
18:32	184	8:33	216, 217, 242
19:9	91	8:34	222, 242
19:25	217, 221, 222	9:39	216, 217, 242
19:26	221	9:40	222, 242
19:36	80	11:11	221, 242
20:1	17, 27, 31, 32, 34, 35, 48, 49, 50, 53, 55, 85-91, 97, 139, 142, 162, 163, 164	11:14	236
20:22	91	12:19	181
21:7	221, 222	14:7	223, 225, 242
21:8	222	17:21	243
21:19	221	18:6	236
23:7	221	18:10	223, 224
23:8	216, 220, 221	18:13	236
<u>1 Kings</u>		20:5	221
1:4	194	23:15	227
2:11	205	23:15-16	228
2:23	188	26:24	228
3:5	204	<u>2 Chronicles</u>	
8:9	190	7:1	182
8:11	182	7:12	204
		7:21	238, 242
		9:7	70, 233, 238, 242
		10:16	17, 34, 35, 36, 37, 40, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50,

	54, 55, 85-91, 97, 142,		162, 164, 168
	162, 163	32:5	118, 120
18:10	225	34:1-37	209
20:2	243	34:5	210, 211
20:29	184	34:5-6	209
24:24	141	34:6	209-211, 242
25:22	91	34:7	210
32:22	236	34:36-37	209
36:4	223	38:7	212
36:5	223	38:13	225
<u>Ezra</u>		38:15	225
8:27	159	<u>Psalms</u>	
<u>Esther</u>		3:8	145, 157, 162
2:7	155, 161	6:1-10	109
5:11	155	9:7-10	109
9:1	184	10:3	192
<u>Job</u>		16:10	111
1:1	193	16:11	143, 159, 161
1:5	168, 170, 185, 191-195	18:26	72
1:6	212	18:36	53, 71, 72
1:8	193	22:17	54, 55
1:11	185, 191-195	29:1	212
1:21	193	29:2	142, 161, 163
1:22	193	30:1	109
2:1	212	30:3	111
2:3	193	33:1	144
2:5	185, 191-195	37:20	184
2:9	168, 185, 191-195	42:3	20, 198-202, 241
5:15	236	45:5	153, 159
7:20	17, 21, 26, 27, 31, 32,	45:6	184
	35, 36, 49, 50, 53, 55,	49:12	142, 163
	68, 76, 79-81, 129, 137,	49:15	111
	146, 162, 164, 168, 197,	50:1	203
	241, 247	50:23	161
9:7	239	68:7	146
9:19	168	68:13	155, 161
9:21	209	68:15	151
9:24	168	68:18	142, 158, 163
9:35	168	68:28	145, 161
10:7	209	68:36	147, 159, 161
10:15	84	72:20	145, 161
12:2	153	73:24	111
13:18	209	78:25	141, 154
16:17	209	80:14	225, 226
16:22	194	82:1	71
19:6-7	210	84:5	202
19:9	100	84:7	212
19:25-26	111	84:8	20, 198, 202-206
27:2	210	94:12	146, 161
27:5	209	101:5	146, 148
31:27	96	102:17	204
32:1	116, 117, 118, 119	102:25	109
32:1-5	118	102:27-29	109
32:2	118, 119	104:2	141
32:3	17, 21, 34, 35, 43, 49,	106:4	102
	50, 53, 55, 115-120, 124,	106:6	97
		106:20	17, 21, 26, 27, 32, 34, 35,

	36, 43, 49, 50, 55, 97-105, 160, 162, 170, 182, 183, 195, 196, 249		40:8 109 41:2 143 42:1,4 108 42:8,11 102 43:4 157 43:21 108 44:9 97 44:10 97 44:27 108 45:1 108 45:1-5 65 45:4 18 48:1 194 48:9 208 48:11 112, 207-209, 241 51:4 108 53:13 153 54:12 159 56:2 146, 150 57:5 143 57:8 194 57:15 109 61:6 100 65:1 243
106:47	102		
107:18	21		
107:41	84		
119:50	84, 85		
119:92	84		
<u>Proverbs</u>			
4:22	144		
8:36	153, 159, 161, 162, 231		
10:25	108		
19:23	143, 159		
22:9	158, 161		
25:22	155		
30:6	210		
<u>Ecclesiastes</u>			
1:4	144, 148, 161, 163		
8:1	159		
8:10	143, 157		
<u>Song of Solomon</u>			
1:7	146		
4:3	28		
4:8	28		
5:13	153		
<u>Isaiah</u>			
1:9	173		
1:10	173		
1:12	198-202		
1:26	240		
2:22	151		
3:3	153, 160		
3:6-7	141		
6:3	182		
7:3	143, 156		
8:3	194		
8:7	100		
8:21	78		
9:4	141		
10:5-27	108		
11:9	161		
16:14	100		
17:3,4	100		
17:10	94		
19:1-15	238		
19:16-25	238		
19:18	235, 236, 237, 238-240		
	241		
19:25	238		
21:16	100		
25:2	160		
26:2	152, 158, 161, 162		
26:4	155		
37:16	110		
		<u>Jeremiah</u>	
		2:11	17, 21, 26, 27, 28, 30, 32, 35, 36, 46, 49, 50, 52, 53, 55, 97-105, 160, 162, 182, 183, 195, 196, 249
		2:13	104
		5:14-19	108
		11:5	152
		16:19	97
		23:33	243
		23:39	243
		25:1-13	108
		26:18	237
		31:3	204
		34:16	112
		35:19	70
		48:18	100
		49:1,3	243
		51:39	194
		51:57	194
		52:12	70
		<u>Lamentations</u>	
		3:19	122
		3:19-21	120
		3:20	17, 21, 35, 43, 47, 48, 49, 53, 55, 120-123, 162
		3:21	120
		3:22	122
		5:1-22	109
		5:19	109

Ezekiel

1:28	182
3:12,23	182
8:6	91
8:16	92, 176
8:17	17, 21, 23, 26, 27, 32, 35, 36, 37, 46, 49, 50, 52, 53, 55, 91-97, 162, 170, 176, 196
9:6	159
10:4	182
10:18	182
11:23	182
15:2	94
16:7	145
16:8	194
16:17	155
20:9,14	208
20:39	112
21:29	198
36:20,23	112
37:16,20	243
38:17	159, 162
39:7	112
43:2,5	182
44:4	182
48:35	147

Daniel

12:2	194
------	-----

Hosea

2:11	194
2:17	214
3:5	87, 88, 89, 90
4:6	99
4:6-7	98
4:7	17, 21, 34, 35, 36, 46, 47, 48, 49, 53, 55, 97, 98-105, 121, 160, 162
4:15	168, 235
5:8	235
10:5	159, 162, 235

Amos

1:15	243
2:7	112
3:11	108
6:8	21

Micah

2:8	141
3:12	237
4:2-3	108
7:6	184

Nahum

2:3	94
-----	----

Habakkuk

1:1-4	105
1:2-4	107, 110
1:5-6	111
1:5-11	105, 107
1:6	108
1:12	17, 21, 27, 32, 34, 35, 36, 46, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 105-111, 147, 162, 165
1:12-17	107, 110
2:18	97
3:2	159
3:6	153

Zephaniah

1:5	243
-----	-----

Haggai

1:9	114
-----	-----

Zechariah

2:10-12	65
2:10-13	64
2:12	17, 21, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35, 36, 38, 46, 47, 49, 50, 52, 55, 58, 61, 62-70, 76, 85, 129, 137, 162, 182, 197, 241, 245, 246, 247
2:13	64, 65
9:14	204

Malachi

1:6	115
1:7	115
1:12	17, 20, 21, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 55, 111-115, 162, 196
1:13	17, 21, 27, 32, 35, 36, 46, 49, 50, 52, 55, 111-115, 162, 170, 196
3:8,9	20, 21, 47, 48, 52, 55, 112

John

8:32	151
------	-----

Romans

1:23	102, 104, 183
------	---------------

2 Corinthians

12:1-2	174
--------	-----

Revelation

22:4	200
------	-----

INDEX OF TALMUDIC QUOTATIONS

Babylonian Talmud

- 'Aboda Zara
 3b 142, 158, 163
 4a 159
 4b 177
 11a 143, 157
 45b 18

'Arakin
 2b 201
 10b 159, 162
 13b 143, 159, 161
 15b 146, 148

Baba Bathra
 74b 161
 75b 147
 109a 225
 109b 225
 110a 228
 118b 156

Baba Meši'a
 58b 18
 59a 177
 78b 178
 84a 156

Baba Qamma
 10b 150, 231
 16b 178
 97b 156

Berakoth
 5a 140, 146, 161
 7b 140
 10a 143, 150, 155
 14a 143, 151, 159
 15b 151
 19a 173, 177
 20a 156
 28a 176
 30b 142, 159, 161
 163
 31b-32a 148
 32a 143, 177
 48b 151, 159, 161
 53b 152
 54b 145, 157, 159
 55b 143, 156, 159
 57a 145
 57b 143, 157
 60a 173
 61b 178
 62b 157

 63b 177
 64a 153, 159

Beša
 25b 177

'Erubin
 19a 145
 53a 176
 53a-b 235
 54a 145, 153
 54b 145, 153
 99a 153, 159, 162
 231

Gittin
 56b 143, 157, 174
 57a 174

Ḥagiga
 2a-b 201
 5b 178
 11b 178
 14a 153, 160
 15a 63, 174
 27a 145, 150, 153

Hullin
 27a 150, 161

Kerithoth
 3a 140, 148, 159
 48b 153

Kethubboth
 5a 141, 161
 5a-b 151
 8b 173
 49b 174
 111b 159

Makkoth
 10a 177

Megilla
 9a 41, 132, 135,
 246
 11a 176
 12a, 12b 177
 13a 155, 161
 14a 147, 165
 15a 174
 15b 143, 145, 155,
 157, 159, 162,
 174
 25a-b 18, 178

 25b 159, 162, 173, 194
 27b 18
 28a 145, 155, 159, 161,
 231
 28b 153

Menahoth
 29b 146, 155, 161
 53b 146, 165
 110a 239

Mo'ed Qatan
 5a 161
 9b 142, 163, 177
 25a 178
 28b 63, 174

Nedarim
 2a-b 175
 37b-38a 140

Nidda
 13a 143
 73a 153

Pesahim
 3a 172
 49b 145
 117a 146, 153, 161

Qiddushin
 30a 153, 160, 165, 226
 30b 153, 161

Rosh Hashana
 3a 231
 11a 145
 13a-b 150
 13b 160

Sanhedrin
 4b 201
 17a 159, 162
 22a 146
 37a 141
 46a 177
 54b 140, 148, 149
 56a 18, 175, 177, 183
 63b 159, 162
 93a 177
 93b 156
 95b 63, 174
 96a 177
 99b 146, 153
 103b 226

105b	177
106a	174
110b	152, 160, 161
<u>Shabbath</u>	
30b	142, 150, 161
33a	150, 177
55a	159
63a	153, 159
88b	161, 178
89a	146, 155, 160, 161
114a	153, 159, 161, 231
118b	146, 150, 152
119b	152, 158, 160, 162, 231

<u>Shebu'oth</u>	
35a-b	174, 175
36a	18, 63

<u>Sota</u>	
4b	151
5a	146, 148
5b	161
9a	144
10a-b	155, 162, 231
11a	174
11b	145, 155
12a	159
12b	145, 157, 162
13a	143
13b	155, 231
35a	146, 165
36b	156
36b-37a	145
38a	18
38b	152
49a	159

<u>Sukka</u>	
29a	177
35a	158, 159, 161
48b	174
49a	146, 150, 161
52a	155, 177
52b	177
53a	175

<u>Ta'anith</u>	
4a	144, 153
7a	177
7a-b	177
7b	159, 176
9a	231

<u>Temura</u>	
28b	18

<u>Yebamoth</u>	
79a	79, 173
101a	177

<u>Yoma</u>	
38a	146, 157
39a	161
72b	177
75b	142, 154, 161, 162, 163, 177
77a	93, 176, 177

<u>Zebahim</u>	
115b	145, 159, 161

Palestinian Talmud

<u>Berakoth</u>	
13d	225, 227

<u>Bikkurim</u>	
65c	71, 72, 75, 163

<u>Hagiga</u>	
77d	177

<u>Megilla</u>	
71d	41, 131, 132, 246

<u>Rosh Hashana</u>	
57b	71, 72

<u>Sanhedrin</u>	
23c	177
27d	140, 143, 156
30b	228

<u>Shebi'ith</u>	
35c	152, 158

<u>Ta'anith</u>	
68a	132, 135
68d	156, 157